University of Alberta

Narrating Troubled Times: memories and histories of the English civil wars and Interregnum, 1660-1705

by

Matthew George Neufeld ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

Department of History and Classics

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2008

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-46397-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-46397-0

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

For Teresa Megli Gallagher
1958-1994

Not forgotten

Abstract

After 1660 aspects of England's recently ruptured past were openly remembered despite the 'forgetting' that was commanded by the *Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.* Remembering the civil wars and Interregnum in legal testimony, on petitions and wounded bodies, through historical writings, in letters and in public story-telling was shaped and constrained by the social and political circumstances surrounding these actions. Nevertheless, such acts of remembrance were also purposeful attempts to re-shape the public contexts in which the troubled past was known and brought to bear meaningfully on local or the national community's present circumstances and future direction. Narratives about the troubled times were issued out into the public domain in the hopes either of transforming the English polity or of holding back ideas which might produce another descent into chaos. As the characteristics of the political landscape changed after 1660, so too did the reasons for remembering the wars; the same events or stories could serve different ends depending on the context, both social and temporal, in which they were related. The public memory of the late troubles times was therefore dynamic and in motion, driven by the dialectic of contexts which called forth remembrances and the recollections which attempted to alter those same contexts. In two important respects, however, England's civil wars were remembered in the same way throughout the late seventeenth century. First, stories were put abroad to vindicate one set of principles and its adherents, and to vilify the doctrines of its opponents. Secondly, the endurance of explanatory narratives to make sense of the wars demonstrates that while people recognized the present was derived from earlier events, they also continued to think that their past contained examples and figures relevant to and parallel with

contemporary affairs. Remembering the troubled times after 1660 in print, in testimony, on damaged flesh and in epistles was to tell stories about the broken past and thus to become a Restoration historian.

Acknowledgments

A wise teacher once remarked to me about the vital importance of securing a material base for doctoral studies. I feel myself obliged, therefore, to thank first the two instutitutions whose generousity supported my work over the past five years: the University of Alberta and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The former funded the first and the final years of my program, initially with a Recruitment Scholarship and later with a Dissertation Fellowship; the latter carried me financially through the middle three years of the degree with a Canada Graduate Scholarship Doctoral Fellowship. Alberta's reciprocal relationship with Royal Holloway College, University of London, affored me the opportunity to spend the winter and spring of 2006 as a visiting post-graduate student in the UK. I must also thank the University's Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for awarding me a Research Abroad Travel Grant, which allowed me to remain in the UK during the 2006-2007 academic year as a visiting student at the University of York. Preliminary research in England was conducted in the spring of 2005 thanks to a travel award from the Sir Winston Churchill Society of Edmonton.

I would not have been able to write this thesis without the help and kindness of the staffs at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, the British Library, Durham University Library Special Collections, Leeds University Library Special Collections, the Borthwick Institute for Archives, York, York Minster Library, and the inter-library loan departments of the University of York and the University of Alberta. The assistance offered by the employees of the National Archives, Kew, the Devon Record Office, the Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, the Cheshire and Chester Record Office, the West Yorkshire

Archive Service, Wakefield, the North Yorkshire Record Office, and Doctor Williams Library, London was also extremely useful and much appreciated.

For reading chapters of the thesis and offering their constructive criticism I would like to thank Nadine Lewycky, Christopher Baxfield, Jacqueline Rose, Matthew Jenkinson, Gary Rivett, Koji Yamamoto, Stephen R. Roberts, J. R. Jones, Stephen Taylor, and Blair Worden. While I was a visiting student at York I benefitted a great deal from the insights, suggestions and supervision of David Wootton. I must offer profound thanks to Katharina Megli, who spent hours pouring over my prose in order to make it lucid and readable. My meetings with her, during which times we went over four chapters page by page, saved me many solitary days of revising. Very special appreciation is due to the members of my supervisory and examining committees for reading and commenting upon full drafts of the thesis: Andrew Gow, Sylvia Brown, David Gay, and Mark Knights. The suggestions of these august collectives have made, and will make, my work immeasurably better. Two additional members of both these committees merit particular mention: Lesley Cormack for stimulating conversations about early modern British culture after the Reformations, and for judicious and careful readings of the thesis; and Daniel Woolf for exemplary supervision. There are many superlatives which might be used to describe Daniel's oversight of my intellectual formation here at Alberta as an early modern British historian, but I think 'first-class' sums it up well. As a Dean of Arts and as a historian of global historical writing Daniel is a very busy man, yet thanks to his diligence and the wonder of digital communications technology, he always answered my sometimes panicky questions, read my turgid prose, wrote letters on my behalf, and offered suggestions for improving my thinking about Restoration historical culture, with lightening speed.

Final thanks go to the very special and select cohort which composes my spiritual base of support. Christine, Kent, Liam and Brontë Rygiel have provided food, shelter and joyful welcome on numerous occasions; Michael Neufeld's friendship and encouragement have helped me through many a solitary weekend. My parents, Arnie and Trudi Neufeld, were with me at the very beginning of this academic pilgrimage, and their love and prayers have sustained me throughout the journey beyond all hope and imagining. Nadine Lewycky, soon to be delivered of her own doctoral thesis, has provided incomparable intellectual and emotional companionship, which has made me a better scholar and a better human being.

Ultimately, I must acknowledge the grace of the One for whom all things are possible: *My soul doth magnify the Lord: and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour…He remembering his mercy hath holpen his servant Israel: as he promised to our forefathers, Abraham and his seed for ever* (The 'Song of Mary' as rendered by the Book of Common Prayer).

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.. 1

II. Restoration Remembrances: recollections of a pardonable past in the Answers of defaulting accountants, 1662-1664................................ 26

III. Restoration Remembrancers: accounting for the civil wars and Interregnum in historical writing, 1661-1671.. 71

IV. Painful Memories: narratives of injury in the petitions and on the bodies of royalist veterans, 1660-1690....................................... 125

V. Memorable Re-presentations: civil war and Interregnum history in England, 1680-85.. 173

VI. Vindicators of Memory: civil war histories and the struggle for posterity in an age of parties, 1696-1705.. 226

VII. Memories of the True Martyrs: witnessing to Anglican civil-war suffering in letters to John Walker, 1704-5.................................. 284

VIII. Conclusion... 331

Bibliography.. 341

Such, indeed, is the policy of civil war; severely to remember injuries, and to forget the most important services. Revenge is profitable, gratitude is expensive.

Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. I, cap. xi.

Forgetting is essential to action of any kind, just as not only light but darkness too is essential for the life of everything organic.

Friedrich Nietzsche, 'On the uses and disadvantages of history for life'

I.

Introduction

England's troubled times ended in 1660 with acts and promises of forgetting. The 1640s had witnessed an unprecedented level of political turmoil, violence, and religious upheaval, which was followed in the 1650s by serial regime changes. Graphic testimony of the desire to blot out the recent past remains in the journal of the House of Commons; in February 1660 the newly reconstituted Long Parliament ordered a series of prior resolutions recorded in the volume covering September 1648 to June 1649 to be 'nulled' or 'obliterated.' Many of the entries subsequently scribbled over or crossed out referred to particular members who had been readmitted to the purged Commons in early 1649, just weeks after it had tried and executed King Charles I.[1] Not long after these records were purged the dead king's eldest son, still in exile on the Continent, promised a 'free and general pardon' to nearly all his subjects in return for the restoration of his right. This promise was kept within months of Charles II's return to England with the Convention Parliament's passing of an Act of Indemnity and Oblivion; forgetting the previous two decades was now the law of the land.[2]

---

[1] House of Lords Record Office, London; Manuscript Journal of the House of Commons, HL/CL/JO/1/33: 2 September 1648 to 13 June 1649, pg. 639. I am grateful to John Morrill for suggesting that I consult these materials.

The Act of Oblivion did not, of course, stop people from remembering the broken times. In 1662 Grace Batishill, a Devonshire widow, petitioned her local magistrates for compensation because her late husband had been 'unjustly and inhumanely hanged for his loyalty' to the king during the civil wars.[3] That same year one William Crud from Cambridge testified before a commission from the Court of Exchequer that sometime in 1644 he had handed over £200, collected from 'reputed delinquents,' to the 'then Treasurers for Sequestrations at the Guildhall.'[4] Not long afterward another widow, Lucy Hutchinson, began to compose for her children the story of her husband John's time as a Parliamentary colonel, while also incorporating in her account national events 'necessary to be remembered' from those days.[5] Despite being a powerful and far-reaching narrative, Hutchinson's biography justifying her husband's service was not published during the seventeenth century because of its harsh criticism of the Stuart dynasty. By contrast, in 1665 Edward Phillips was able to get to press his moderately royalist history of the wars, published within a revised edition of Sir Richard Baker's massive chronicle of English kings. Despite its bias Phillips's declared that his story of the 'deplorable and unhappy passages' from the recent past was 'as near to truth as my utmost search can discover, to lay down matter of Fact, and then let the World judge whether side were most to be charged with the Blood spilt in the late Wars.'[6]

---

[2] The 'Declaration of Breda, 4 April 1660' and the 'Act of Oblivion' are extracted in J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 357-8, 365-81

[3] Devon Record Office, Quarter Session files 129/101/3, Petition of Grace Batishill, 1662.

[4] The National Archives, Kew; Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, 'Bills and Answers against Defaulting Accountants' [TNA hereafter], E113/5 (Cambridgeshire), Answer of William Crud, April 1662.

[5] Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, N. H. Keeble (ed.), (London: J.M. Dent, 1995), 84.

Through a qualitative analysis of ways in which a selection of English women and men remembered, represented, and transmitted aspects of the turbulent 1640s and 1650s in stories told and stories written, this study aims to enhance our understanding of the civil war and Interregnum's legacy in late Stuart England's historical culture.[7] It is my contention that the four people mentioned above were fundamentally doing the same thing—they were remembering and narrating aspects of their nation's broken past to shape future moments of recalling those years. The accounts of the troubled times to be examined below were constrained and shaped by the political and social contexts from which they emerged. Nonetheless, the recollections of Batishill, Hutchinson, Crudd and Phillips were put abroad with the intention of transforming the wider political and religious circumstances in which the civil wars and Interregnum would be remembered, and given meaning, in the future. Over time the reason for remembering the wars changed, along with the political context of remembering, but many of the stories and their lessons remained the same.

Although until recently most scholarship on the Stuart period has focussed on explaining and understanding the origins, outcomes and significance of the British civil wars, there is now an increasing body of literature concerned with the political and religious history of late Stuart Britain, viewed as a nation struggling to sort out the legacies of the wars, the Restoration settlements, and ultimately the so-called Glorious

---

[6] Edward Phillips, 'The reign of King Charles' in Sir Richard Baker, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England* (London: Ellen Cotes for George Saubridg, 1665), 458.

[7] Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 9.

Revolution of 1688.[8] Much attention has been given to the problem of determining whether the civil wars’ legacy was to foster conflict or to encourage consensus in English society. Among historians who link the wars to later political tensions, Ronald Hutton argues that the fundamental issue which led to violence in the 1640s were not resolved by the parliamentary settlements of 1660 and 1661-1662.[9] Both Paul Seaward and Mark Knights contend that the Restoration regime’s quest for stability was undermined by unresolved constitutional issues, primarily by the relationship between the royal prerogative and parliamentary consent.[10] Tim Harris’s work, by contrast, has emphasized the importance of religious tensions, partly left over from the mid-century upheavals but more importantly entrenched by the Restoration’s religious settlements in the three kingdoms, for generating political and eventually party conflict. Whigs and Tories ultimately differed from each other over the question of tolerating or persecuting Nonconforming Protestants.[11] In his book about the relationship between London’s municipal politics and national events, Gary De Krey highlights the significance for periodically destabilizing the regime of what he calls the city’s Reformed Protestants, and the importance of their vision of a more comprehensive church settlement.[12] Among historians who emphasise the stabilizing consequences of the civil wars in Restoration England, John Miller has pointed out that the structure and practice of local governance mitigated the political and religious tensions inherited from the mid-century period. According to Miller, the fact that the Stuart monarchy faced a severe crisis in 1679-81 over the question of the succession of the Catholic Duke of York, and that the same man as King James II lost his crown in 1688, has wrongly fixed historians' attention on instances of partisanship after 1660.[13]

---

[8] The quantity of scholarship dealing with the mid-century wars is legion. For an introduction to the historiographical debates, especially since the advent of 1970s ‘revisionism,’ see Ronald Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), 32-58. Some of the transformations within later Stuart scholarship can be traced by comparing the essays in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie (eds.) *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (London: Blackwell, 1990), with those in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus (eds.) *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). See also Justin Champion, ‘Religion’s safe, with priestcraft is the war’: Augustan anti-clericalism and the legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720,’ *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 547-61; John Marshall, ‘Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution,’ *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 515-30; Tim Harris, ‘The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution,’ *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 501-14; and Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[9] Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

[10] Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); *The Restoration, 1660-1685* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991); Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[11] Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993); *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (New York: Allen Lane, 2005).

There is general agreement among scholars, however, that the knowledge of the recent past, often labelled the 'memory of the civil wars,' mattered for public affairs after 1660.[14] For example, Seaward claims that 'the experience of the civil wars so occupied the minds of politicians that the slightest signs of parliamentary disagreement tended to invite morbid parallels with 1641.'[15] Miller acknowledges that during the crisis over the Duke of York's succession 'perceptions of events [were] coloured by memories of the civil war.' Similarly, N. H. Keeble concludes that by 1670 'the memory of the anarchic collapse of the Republic [in 1659-1660] was still sufficiently fresh to disincline the majority of English again to try that experiment.'[16] Jonathan Scott argues provocatively that after the Restoration, English politicians and the wider public were prisoners to the memory of troubled times, which he posits was a combination of remembered experience and ideological phobias, primarily the fear of 'popery and arbitrary government.'[17] Yet according to John Spurr, the political debates of the 1670s were about much more than concerns about popery and arbitrary government, previously and potentially actualized, but also involved questions about how to define the national interest, the role of consumption in the national economy, the feasibility of religious toleration, and the power, for good or ill, of news and information, including knowledge about the recent past.[18]

---

[12] Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[13] John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), and 'Containing Division in Restoration Norwich,' *English Historical Review* 121 (2006), 1019-1047. In other words, had James II not attempted to use his royal prerogative to give Catholicism, and dissenting Protestant groups, the same legal protection as the Church of England in 1687, the Revolution of 1688-89 would not have occurred. See also J.R. Jones, "James II's Revolution: royal policies 1686-1692" in Jonathan Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its Impact*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 48-74.

[14] For example, B. Behrens argued 'there might have been a revolution in 1681, if the memories of 1642 had been less vivid;' 'The Whig theory of the constitution in the reign of Charles II' *Cambridge Historical Journal*, (1941-42), 42-71; cf. Austin Woolrych: '"Forty-one is come again" was a common cry when the going threatened to get really rough in the 1670s, and it was an effective deterrent;' *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 795.

[15] Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 325.

The expansion of discourses about the past in English culture after 1660 is further testimony to the continuing importance for contemporaries of the late troubled times. For instance, Keeble notes that the 1660s witnessed a sharp increase in the number of diaries, memoirs and autobiographies written.[19] Likewise, the quantity of historical writing in England rose sharply after 1660, including works concerned with explaining the recent past.[20] A number of scholars have examined late seventeenth-century historical writings looking for signs of development in the author's method and approach to the past. One pioneering effort to survey civil war histories was undertaken by Royce MacGillivray, who organized his analysis largely on the basis of historians' ideological positions.[21] In his chronologically broader summary of historical debates over the causes of the English Revolution, R. C. Richardson argues that opposing ideological views among Restoration historians also reflected divergent theories of history.[22] J.P. Kenyon's treatment of seventeenth-century historians, whose methods and ambitions evinced an inchoate modern historical method and consciousness, focussed on major authors some of whom wrote about the civil wars, including James Harrington, Thomas Hobbes, the earl of Clarendon, and Gilbert Burnet.[23] Similarly, Laird Okie highlights the connection between early eighteenth-century Whig histories with secular notions of causation and early Enlightenment philosophy.[24]

---

[16] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 254; N. H. Keeble, *Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 208.

[17] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 26.

[18] John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

[19] Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 4.

[20] D.R. Woolf, "Narrative Historical Writing in Restoration England: A Preliminary Survey" in W. Gerald Marshall (ed.), *The Restoration Mind* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 207-51; see also David Norbrook, 'The English Revolution and English Historiography' in N. H. Keeble (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 236.

Not all are convinced, however, that modern historiography ought to seek out intellectual progenitors in the late seventeenth century. Justin Champion has argued that the *ars historica* was as rhetorical and didactic after the Restoration as before.[25] With much the same caution Philip Hicks has insisted that, because histories continued to be judged according to classical standards well into the eighteenth century, modern critics ought not to use anachronistic measures of method and theory when analysing such writings.[26] There is a similar tendency among a growing number of critics and cultural historians to treat histories as exemplars of a literary genre for making the past meaningful in the present.[27] For example, Paulina Kewes has recently claimed that after the Restoration historical writing witnessed a trend toward heightened parallels and correspondences, which yielded to more polite forms of disputation after 1700.[28]

---

[21] Royce MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974).
[22] R. C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* Third Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 15, 22.
[23] J. P. Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1993); Kenyon's modernist criteria meant that for him histories written by the clergy did not contribute much to scholarship.
[24] Laird Okie, *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English Enlightenment* (Lanham, MY: University Press of America, 1991).
[25] J. A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: the Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 26-51. On the Renaissance art of history see Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[26] Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996).

Scholarship concerned with the ways early modern English people interpreted and used their past is no longer focussed primarily on historians and their writings. Keith Thomas, David Cressy and Ronald Hutton use a wide array of manuscript sources to shed light on popular perceptions of the past, particularly in the wake of England's religious reformations.[29] Likewise drawing upon a broad range of printed and manuscript materials, Daniel Woolf has argued that social factors, primarily the increasing volume, speed and breadth of information about the past in circulation, facilitated the development of a national historical culture, and a sense of the 'national past,' during England's early modern period.[30] English people's thinking about their past did change during the early modern period, Woolf contends, but this was due largely to the increasing number both of producers and of consumers of historical knowledge and not to the triumph of humanist historiography.[31]

---

[27] See the essays in D.R. Kelley and D.H. Sacks (eds.), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric and Fiction, 1500-1800*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997); Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992), Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: literature, history, sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), Andrew Escobedo *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[28] Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 1-33.

[29] Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-century England* (London: Penguin, 1971), 461-514; David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[30] Woolf, *Social Circulation, passim*.

The turn of many scholars from a singular focus on historical writing to the social contexts of making and appropriating historical knowledge has had implications for understanding late seventeenth-century perceptions of the troubled times. Daniel Woolf recently reminded historians that well into the eighteenth century much historical discourse circulated orally long before being transposed into print; histories about the wars therefore represent only a small fraction of what people remembered and said about the recent past.[32] As part of his broad survey of early modern British oral culture, Adam Fox points out that the civil wars introduced new memorial sites and noteworthy characters into popular historical memory.[33] By suggesting that in the later 1690s a literary circle of radical Whigs deliberately suppressed religious aspects of the Parliamentarian Edmund Ludlow's memoirs prior to their publication in order to make them more relevant, Blair Worden shows how vulnerable to manipulation for political purposes was England's historical memory of the civil wars.[34]

The notion that a nation possesses something called historical memory is largely the consequence of a broad intellectual development in a number of disciplines which can be called 'the turn to memory.' This movement warrants a brief survey.[35] Ever increasing numbers of scholars have begun to look at memory: first, as an activity and process in which the past is brought to bear on the present; second, as a tool for conceptualising the relationship between the past and the present for both individuals and groups.[36] Several important studies on the ways in which and purposes for which communities recover, represent and employ notions of a common past are derived from the theories of French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, a student of Emile Durkheim and friend of the early French *Annalistes*.[37] Halbwachs argued that individual memory is in fact largely a social creation, shaped by present concerns and carried by what he called 'social frameworks,' which are groups such as families, work-places, and nations.[38] The representations of a purportedly common past created and sustained by groups and communities have been called variously 'collective' or 'social memories.'[39] A great deal of work on social memory has concerned how images of the past are used to articulate and foster a sense of group identity.[40] To highlight just one example, according to Nachman Ben-Yehuda, the memory of Jewish resistance at Masada, occurring from 67 to

---

[31] Daniel Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 33-70; pace Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).

[32] Daniel Woolf, "Speaking of History: Conversations about the past in Restoration England" in Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (eds.) *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 122; see also his *Reading History in Early Modern England, 1475-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[33] Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England: 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 255.

[34] Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity*, (London: Penguin, 2002); this book recapitulates arguments made first in A.B. Worden (ed.), *Edmund Ludlow, A Voyce from the Watchtower: Part Five: 1660-1662*, Camden, Fourth Series, vol. 21, (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978).

---

[35] Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 2.

[36] Cubitt, *History and memory*, 4-5. The recent scholarly and popular turns to memory are related to broader social and cultural shifts since the mid 1970s in Eelco Runia, 'Burying the dead, creating the past' *History and Theory* 46 (2007), 313-325.

[37] For example, Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London, Verso, 1991).

[38] Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*. Edited, translated, and with an introduction by Louis Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); originally published in 1925 as *Les Cadres sociaux de la memoire*. For a summary of Halbwachs's theory see Cubitt, *History and memory*, 43-6, 158-64.

[39] James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

[40] Jean-Clément Martin, *La Vendée de la Mémoire, 1800-1980* (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1989); John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The history of a relationship' in John R. Ellis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 3-24. Robert G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Useable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Bernard Rieger 'Was Roland a Nazi? Victims, Perpetrators, and Silences during the Restoration of Civil Identity in Postwar Bremen' *History and Memory* (2007), 75-112. For a reassessment of much of this literature see Wulf Kansteiner, 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies,' *History and Theory* 41 (2002), 179-197.

71 CE, was created and disseminated early in the twentieth century by 'moral entrepreneurs' to give secular Israelis a heroic heritage upon which to build a modern state.[41]

Ben-Yehuda's argument, implying that social memory is more concerned with the present utility of its representations than with what really happened in the past, stems from an influential thesis concerning the difference between memory and history that emerged from Halbwachs's work. Memory for Halbwachs was largely an oral discourse in which the past was reconstructed in ways that accorded with the present. In other words, memory facilitated a sense of continuity between past and present. History, by contrast, was conveyed through printed discourses that highlighted the differences between past and present, and thus tended to arise with rapidly changing modern societies.[42] The dichotomy of memory and history was rearticulated recently by French historian Pierre Nora; for him memory is an unconscious, ritualistic repetition of timeless practices in which of the act of remembering and the meaning of the remembrance are conflated. History, in contrast, is a critical and deliberate discursive organization of the past through *lieux de mémoire*; these 'sites of memory' are self-referential signs that convey the present-day meaning of the past, and do not give access to the past itself.[43] Modern communities, particularly nation-states, Nora contends, are interested in knowing about and commemorating their past precisely because they have lost all living links provided by memory.[44]

---

[41] Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Myth-Making in Israel* (Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin, 1995).

[42] Maurice Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective* (Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1967), digitized by Mme Lorraine Audy, February 2001 [University of Alberta electronic resource, http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1522/cla.ham.mem1, accessed 22 March 2008], 45-8.

[43] These sentiments are echoed in Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 13. See also Mark Salber Phillips, "History, Memory and Historical Distance" in Peter Seixas (ed.) *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 88-102.

Not everyone accepts that memory and history are dichotomous; increasingly they are understood by scholars to be in a sometimes complementary and sometimes contending relationship, regarding both the past and each other. For example, Patrick Hutton argues that traces of the ancient art of memory are present in modern historiography; after all, the intent of much nineteenth-century national historiography was to make certain components of the past memorable.[45] Dominick LaCapra thinks that remembering and historical writing must be neither separated from nor collapsed into each other, but rather kept in an open dialogic relationship.[46] Paul Ricoeur contends that memory and history both represent the past as an image, that is to say, both must 'stand for' in the present that which is absent—the past.[47] Indeed, Ricoeur provocatively suggests that historians are dependent on human memory for all knowledge about the past, for their historical arguments are certified ultimately by written sources derived largely from oral testimonies.[48] Elizabeth Tonkin, a social anthropologist, disputes Nora's sharp dichotomy between memory and history, claiming it betrays an outmoded distinction between oral and literate modes of communication.[49] Both memory and history convey meaning about the past through genres, understood to be social practices and conventions of discourse through which speakers tell their 'history' and their listeners understand them.[50] Geoffrey Cubitt has asserted that any effort to stabilize the relationship between history and memory will fail since the two terms are not descriptors of competing discourses about the past but rather indicators of cultural tensions between the professional discipline and wider society.[51]

---

[44] Pierre Nora, 'General Introduction: Between memory and history,' in Pierra Nora (ed.), *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* translated by M. Trouille. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 1-6. David Lowenthal has echoed Nora's sentiments in a recent critique of the growth of the heritage industry in modern Britain, a phenomenon which to Lowenthal represents a kind of pillaging of the past in order to affirm contemporary reality. 'Heritage' according to Lowenthal is essentially tribalistic and affirming of the present, while 'history' is universal, critical, and aware of the past's foreignness to the present; David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[45] Patrick Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press, 1993). Ernest Renan argued that "forgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation, which is why progress in historical studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle of] nationality;" cited by Daniel Woolf, 'Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past,' in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer (eds.), *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-cultural approaches to Historiography, Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 71.

[46] Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998). For LaCapra histories ought to be in part the products of critical appraisals of remembered experience.

[47] Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Social scientists, oral historians and a number of philosophers have argued that one very significant characteristic shared by memory and history is their reliance upon narratives for representing the past.[52] Eviatar Zerubavel claims that in the act of remembering and telling stories about the past, human beings give the experience of time a meaningful form.[53] Paul Ricoeur contends that time reaches language through narrativity, and that narrativity is the language structure that has temporality as its ultimate referent.[54] While Ricoeur believes that narrative is imposed retrospectively on people's experience of time, David Carr has suggested that human action, life and historical existence are structured in story form prior to any oral or literary presentation of it.[55] In other words, human beings live in stories even before they tell them.[56] Whether or not this is the case, it is true that as modes of representing the past memory and history rely heavily upon narratives.[57] Memories are composed, Alistair Thomson points out, as interpretations of past and present events using stories provided by a person's culture; these memories in turn help to bring a sense of 'composure' in relation to present life circumstances.[58] According to Jörn Rüsen, history is time which has gained meaning through narration, and therefore historians, however uncomfortable it makes them feel, are fundamentally story-tellers.[59]

---

[48] Ricoeur, *Memory, History*, 147.
[49] Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 97-112. For a similar critique of distinctions between oral and literate modes of communication that are too strong see Ruth Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988).Megan Vaughan, 'Reported Speech and Other Kinds of Testimony' *Journal of Historical Sociology* 13 (2000), 259-60.
[50] A. Portelli, 'Oral History as Genre' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson (eds.), *Narrative and Genre* (London: Routledge, 1998), 23-40.
[51] Cubitt, *History and memory*, 59-61.
[52] Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson, 'Introduction: Genre and Narrative in Life Stories' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson (eds.) *Narrative and Genre* (London: Routledge, 1998), xiv; T. G. Ashplant, 'Anecdote as narrative resource in working-class life stories: parody, dramatization and sequences' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson (eds.), *Narrative and Genre* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 99-113. Stories are arguably decisive for developing senses of personal and group identity; see Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Philosophy* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984); Jerome Bruner, "The Narrative Construction of Reality" in *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1991), 1-21; Michael Mascuch, *The Origin of the Individual Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 21.
[53] Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 12-14.

The view that narrative is vital for representing the past in both remembering and in historical writing provides a new interpretative model through which scholars can compare and understand better later Stuart perceptions of the civil wars and Interregnum.

---

[54] Paul Ricoeur, 'Narrative Time,' *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980), 109; *Time and Narrative: Volume III*. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1984), 244-246; cf. 'Narrative Identity,' *Philosophy Today* 35 (1991), 73-81; Jerome Bruner, 'The Narrative Construction of Reality' *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1991), 15.

[55] David Carr, *Time, Narrative, and History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); 'Place and Time: on the interplay of historical points of view' *History and Theory, Theme Issue* 40 (2000), 153-67; but c.f. Hayden White, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality,' *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 23-45.

[56] The historical anthropologist J.D.Y. Peel suggests that this theory is supported by the encounter between nineteenth-century Christian missionaries and the Yoruba people of Western Africa; 'For Who Hath Despised the Day of Small Things: Missionary Narratives and Historical Anthropology,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37 (1995), 581-607.

[57] Ulla-Maija Peltonen, 'The Return of the Narrator' in Anne Ollila (ed.), *Historical Perspectives on Memory* (Helsinki: SHS-Finnish Historical Society, 1999), 136.

[58] Alistair Thomson, *ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 8-10. On 'composure' as a sense of events and the world which creates a perspective of understanding the movement of the self in time see Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 1994), 22-3.

[59] Jörn Rüsen, *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), 2-4, 10-12; David Carr, 'History as Orientation: Rüsen on Historical Culture and Narration' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 229-43.

An analysis of particular narrations about the late troubled times in acts of remembering and in historical writing provides new insights into the wars' evolving legacy and meaning. Memories in this dissertation are recorded testimonies whose stories represented aspects of the civil war past; the sources used in my dissertation do not shed light on individual people's consciousness about their personal experience or national events. An interpretation of testimonies as stories, however, opens small windows of insight into how certain seventeenth-century individuals made sense of particular aspects of the recent troubles in light of their present circumstances.[60] To understand civil war histories as narrative fruits of social memory, that is, of the process by which knowledge about the past was developed and sustained, ultimately with a view to becoming part of individual memory, sheds light on the ways the ruptured past could be used to shape expectations of the future.[61]

To this end, the following analysis explores a selection of stories about the ruptured past that were conveyed in testimony, manuscripts and printed histories, and even on human bodies in the four and half decades after monarchical government was restored and the nation was commanded to forget.[62] Although people remembered the wars and wrote histories to understand them prior to 1660, the new beginning heralded by the king's return and the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion serves as a fitting point at which to commence a study of efforts to make sense of much that many wished had never happened.[63] Our knowledge of early modern England's historical culture, particularly the ways very different people attempted to knit meaning retrospectively into an experience of national catastrophe, will be expanded by recognizing that the historian Edward Phillips and the widow Grace Batishill, along with the ex-collector William Crud and the earl of Clarendon were all narrating the past, albeit in different forms and for dissimilar reasons.[64]

---

[60] For a similar approach to testimony see Joel T. Rosenthal, *Telling Tales: Sources and Narration in Late Medieval England* (University Park, PN: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).
[61] This is a view with early modern antecedents, as Daniel Woolf points out in *Social Circulation*, 269.
[62] The term rupture is better suited to the negative assessments of the violence and unprecedented political and religious developments during the civil wars and Interregnum than the potentially anachronistic and ethically inappropriate term 'trauma;' see Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver, 'Introduction' in Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 2-12; c.f. Dominic LaCapra, *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), and Martha Minnow, *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998).

The wider 'memory of the troubled times' was thus a diverse, fluid and changing stream of narratives about the recent past which circulated throughout English society as oral and written communication. My purpose is not to trace the water's ebb and flow, but rather to examine a few of the material sediments remaining in its now dry bed. It is clear, however, from what is already known about late seventeenth-century England, that political factors influenced the volume, composition and direction of remembering and historical writing.[65] Civil war memories and histories were purposeful representations of the past that were constrained and shaped by political and social contexts. Another way of putting this is to say that remembering and historical writing occurred in a number of public settings.[66] The chapters which follow present a collage of later seventeenth-century testimonial and historiographical recollections of turbulent public affairs, framed by general and particular public settings, and put abroad to shape public perceptions of the civil wars.

---

[63] Mark Hartman, 'Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution, 1640-1660,' (Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 1978); Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 32-54.
[64] Mark Stoyle, 'Remembering the English Civil War' in Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 19-20.
[65] Jason McElligott, '"A Couple of Hundred Squabbling Small Tradesmen"? Censorship, the Stationers' Company, and the state in early modern England,' *Media History* 11:1/2 (2005), 87-104.
[66] This notion of public contexts is drawn from Thomson, *ANZAC memories*, 8-12.

For example, the legal framework within which testimony was uttered and histories were written, and either published or left to circulate in manuscript, was the product of broader political developments put in place by what could be called the national public—Parliament, the Court, the judiciary, the Church, the natural rulers of the counties, and so forth. This more general public also provided the cultural repertoire of languages and images, such as the language of honour and the image of the martyr, upon which speakers and authors could draw to make themselves understood by their audience or readers.[67] Remembering and historical writing also emerged within and were framed by more particular publics. In the case of Grace Batishil, her story about her late husband emerged in the legal setting of her local Quarter Sessions.[68] There are at least two more public contexts of remembering to bear in mind before turning to the story-tellers and their accounts of the troubled times. First, the narratives in the memories and histories to be examined were concerned largely with representing aspects of public affairs, that is, events, institutions, offices, figures, and the national religion which exercised power and influence in the English polity.[69] Second, the remembering people and historical writers in late Stuart England were concerned to varying degrees with an increasingly important rhetorical community, the public as the whole nation, and its opinion about the implications of the troubled times for the present.[70] Therefore, it was within multiple public contexts that stories about the troubled times circulated and were given meaning by their tellers and their audience.

---

[67] Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeen-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); On honour as a frame of reference, that is, a language, set of images, even a prejudice for imagining identity, see R. Malcolm Smuts, *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685* (London: Macmillian, 1999), 9-16.

[68] On the importance of particular publics for the emergence of larger public spheres of discourse see Phil Withington 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship, and State Formation in Early Modern England' *American Historical Review* 112 (2007), 1016-38.

[69] The notion of public time is discussed at greater length in J. G. A. Pocock, 'Modes of political and historical time in early eighteenth-century England' in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 91-102.

The second chapter examines a collection of legal testimonies from men who were engaged in collecting public revenue during the 1640s and 1650s, and for this reason were exempted from the indemnity provisions of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.[71] Beginning in 1662 many of these former public servants, called defaulting accountants, were required to give account for the monies they had collected to special commissions representing the revenue side of the Court of Exchequer. The records of their testimonies, known as Answers, have hitherto been used by historians to understand local governance and fiscal administration during the wars and Interregnum.[72] This chapter, however, treats the Answers of the defaulting accountants as a particular kind of story, a 'Restoration Remembrance,' in which the defendants, as the accountants were known to the court, took advantage of the government's two approaches to the recent past, oblivion and selective remembering, to narrate their own history for personal benefit. In particular, the defendents rendered accounts of their past in which their previous public acts were represented as well, truly and presently indemnified.

Since historical writings largely dealt with public time, and were themselves profoundly concerned about contemporary public affairs, the chapters that focus on civil war histories are framed chronologically by significant political moments.[73] The third chapter, the first to focus on historical writings, compares histories written between the king's return in 1660 and the death of General George Monck, duke of Albermarle, in 1670. It was Monck more than anyone else who had helped to restore Charles II to his throne, and Monck's departure coincided with a new political mood, one that was less concerned with reconciliation and paying off past debts.[74] Two kinds of civil war histories are examined; first, national histories which aimed to tell the story of public affairs or a national institution, and second, personal histories which were concerned with one or more particular lives. The chapter's chronological boundary, the 1660s, allows for comparisons of well-known works usually treated separately, such as Lucy Hutchinson's biography of Colonel John Hutchinson and Thomas Hobbes's *Behemoth*, and also less familiar histories including Richard Perrinchief's *Life of King Charles I* and W. C.'s *History of the Commons Warre*.[75] Although written from different ideological standpoints, the purpose of these national and personal histories was to show the applicability of general principles to England's particular recent catastrophe. A further effect of this kind of historical writing was to remind the public of the future's reverence for those who died for the right principles, and of the ever-present danger of another conflagration from those who still adhered to false doctrines.

---

[70] Tim Harris, 'Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain' in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 125-153; Geoff Baldwin, 'The "public" as a rhetorical community in early modern England' in Alexandra Walsham and Phil Withington (eds.), *Communities in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 199-215; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 67-108; Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), 273-92.

[71] TNA, E113, 'Bills and Answers against Defaulting Accountants.'

[72] S. R. Roberts, 'Public or Private? Revenge and recovery at the restoration of Charles II,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986), 172-88; M. J. Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in Seventeenth-Century England: Local Administration and Response*, (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 1994).

---

[73] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Robert Brady, 1627-1700. A Cambridge Historian of the Restoration' *Cambridge Historical Review* 10 (1951), 186-204; and 'Modes of political and historical time.'

[74] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 134-45; 170-73, 259; Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, 11-13.

[75] Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, Edited by Ferdinand Tönnies, with an Introduction by Stephen Homes (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990); Richard Perrinchief, 'The Life of King Charles I' in William Fulman and Richard Perrinchief (eds.), *Basilika: The Works of King Charles the Martyr…with the history of his life…* London: 1662); W.C. *History of the Commons Warre of England* (London: Joshua Coniers, 1662).

Historians were not alone in reminding the English public about the political lessons that ought to be drawn from their recent past. The fourth chapter turns back to a collection of testimonies conveyed by petitions and certificates from wounded royalist war veterans, their comrades, commanders, their neighbours, as well as a few war widows. Through these documents royalist veterans recounted their civil war service and wounding to the Justices at their local Quarter Session court to secure a public benefit—a pension. Historians have previously used petitions to trace patterns of local allegiance during the civil wars, to find evidence of plebeian political consciousness, and to demonstrate the existence of popular royalist sentiment before and after the troubles.[76] This chapter, by contrast, argues that maimed soldiers' stories, petitions and damaged bodies were themselves public reminders of particular aspects of the troubled times, which the nation's governors hoped would encourage the people to remember the temporal and providential rewards of fidelity to the crown. As the public became increasingly divided along partisan lines in the aftermath of the Popish Plot and Exclusion crisis, maimed royalist soldiers seem to have become important representations of the virtue of loyalty for the crown's Tory supporters.

Chapter five returns to historical writing, focusing on works that were published in the aftermath of the Popish Plot in 1680 down to the death of Charles II in 1685, a period during which political events arguably were so much shaped by the memory of the

---

[76] David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 192-9; Geoffrey Hudson, 'Arguing Disability: ex-servicemen's stories in early modern England' J. Pickstone and R. Bivins (eds.), *Medicine, Madness and Social History: Essays in Honour of Roy Porter* (London: Palgrave, 2007), 105-17. David J. Appleby, 'Unnecessary persons? Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex, 1642-1662' *Essex Archaeology and History*, 32 (2001), 209-21; Mark Stoyle, 'Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of King Charles's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730' *History* 88 (2003), 207-26.

1640s that the early 1680s were in fact a 'repeat screening' of the troubled past.[77] By examining together a variety of published historical writings about the civil wars and Interregnum, reprints, translations, collections, memoirs and original works, this chapter demonstrates that the aim of their authors was for their text to serve as present-centred memorable representations that would suggest to the public purported parallels between the 1640s and the 1680s. [78] Perceptions of historical repetition during the early 1680s, for instance, that '41 is come again,' were in part deliberately fostered by the form that much published civil war historical writing took during this period, offering the public largely recycled and reworked older texts, documents and stories from the ruptured past. The intent of both Whig and Tory historical writing was to create perceptions continuity between the past and the present, in other words, to encourage a view of the past as a mirror of the present.[79]

The constitutional and political consequences of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 changed the national public setting in which the civil wars were henceforth remembered, while also fostering new reasons for recalling the late troubled times. The sixth chapter stays with historical writings to examine how England's civil war past was increasingly presented publicly to defend or to attack the post-Revolution polity. Its chronological focus is framed by lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 and the dissolution of Queen Anne's first Parliament in 1705. The latter date is admittedly less important for the quality and quantity of historical writing than the first, yet it was chosen partly from the conviction that roughly a decade's worth of source material provides an adequate sample of post-Revolution civil war historiography, partly from the fact that by 1705 nearly all personal memories of the 1640s were lost,[80] and also from the recognition that the publication from 1702 to 1704 of the earl of Clarendon's monumental *History of the Rebellion* fundamentally changed the field of civil war historical writing.[81] After the *History* was published historians were often as much in dialogue with the former Lord Chancellor's work as with their sources from the troubled times.

---

[77] For a summary of this interpretation see Scott, *England's Troubles*, 20-42, 203, 435-42.

[78] John Rushworth, *Historical Collections: Second Part* (London: J.D. for John Wright and Richard Chiswell, 1680), John Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State* (London: S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke, T. Sawbridge and C. Mearne, 1682); Nathaniel Crouch, *The Wars in England, Scotland and Ireland* (London: John How, 1681); Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682); Thomas Frankland, *TheAannals of King James and King Charles the First* (London: Tho. Braddyll for Robert Clavel, 1681); Thomas May, *Arbitrary Government Displayed to the Life* (London: Charles Leigh, 1682); this author is not the person of the same name commissioned to write a history of the Long Parliament during the civil wars.

[79] Tim Harris, '"Lives, Liberties and Estates:" Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds.), *Politics and Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 217-41; Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 11-15; Harris, *Restoration*, 237-50; Grant Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse in the British Monarchies, 1681-5' (Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2003) and *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).

Clarendon's history, like other post-Revolution histories to be examined, was a purposeful intervention in the expanding arena of political debate which, by aiming to reshape the public perceptions of the troubled past, endeavoured either to uphold or to criticise the post-Revolution polity.[82] So too did lesser know works examined in chapter six, such as Edward Walker's *Historical Discourses* and Roger Coke's *Detection of the*

---

[80] There were of course a few hardy souls, including Richard Cromwell, who lived into the second decade of the eighteenth century.

[81] Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*...Three Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1702-1704). While I do not here attempt a new interpretation of his history, Clarendon's *Life* does feature as one of the personal histories examined in the second chapter, and the prefaces to the *History*, as well an abridgement of it, are discussed in the fifth chapter. Clarendon's *History* is not treated here partly because its size and complexity warrant an entire thesis, because of all seventeenth-century civil war histories it has received the most attention already, and because Clarendon's entire corpus is currently being republished and reassessed under the supervision of very senior later Stuart scholars, to whose judgement and erudition I gladly yield.

[82] On the complicated composition of the *History* see the articles by C. H. Firth, 'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion' *English Historical Review* 19 (1904), 26-54, 246-62, and 464-483. Recent assessments of Clarendon's historical method, its merits and intellectual context include Ronald Hutton, 'Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*' *English Historical Review* 97 (1982), 70-88; Martine Watson Brownley, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); Richardson, *Debate on the English Revolution*, 29-36; Hicks, *Neoclassical history*, 55-80; Paul Seaward. 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the civil wars of Europe' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 289-303. Paul Seaward and Martin Dzelzainis are supervising the publication of critical editions of Clarendon's histories and his autobiography by Oxford University Press; the first volumes are due to appear in 2009.

court and state of England, and also more famous histories, including Edmund Calamy's abridgement of Richard Baxter's *Reliquiae Baxterianae* and Sir Philip Warwick's *Memoirs of the reigne of King Charles I*.[83] These and other civil war histories from this period linked the question of identifying those responsible for the wars to contemporary debates over the greatest present danger threatening the public; as such they were testaments to the belief that contemporary national problems needed to be addressed with stories about the troubles in mind, and to the power of such representations to bolster political and religious identities sixty years after the first blood was shed at the battle of Edgehill.

The seventh and final chapter returns to testimonies about the troubled times. It concerns stories of hardships and persecutions endured by clergymen and their families in the 1640s and 1650s related in two hundred letters composed between 1704 and 1705. The correspondence represents the earliest contributions from people across the nation to an historical project undertaken by Church of England minister John Walker.[84] The letters, and other documents from Walker's papers, have been studied previously to understand the experience of clerical wives during the wars, and for the letters' significance in the creation of Walker's published history of puritan persecutions of the Church, *The Suffering of the Clergy*.[85] Until now, however, the letters have not been examined as a mode of representing the past, nor have their stories and the religious implications of these narratives been thoroughly explored. Chapter seven argues that the letters functioned as material witnesses to oral testimonies about the clergy's suffering for the true faith. The aim of these epistolary martyrologies was thus in part to demonstrate the truth of the confession handed down by the Episcopal and legally established Church. At the beginning of Queen Anne's reign these representations of genuine martyrs from the nation's troubled past vindicated the Church's standing as the public's repository of genuine Christian truth.

---

[83] Edward Walker, *Historical Discourses, upon several occasions: viz. 1. The happy progress and success of the arms of K. Charles I* (London: W.B. for Sam. Keble, 1705); Roger Coke, *The detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns, and the Inter-regnum* (London: 1696); Richard Baxter, *An abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his life and times. With an account of many others ... By Edmund Calamy*. ... (London: printed by S. Bridge, for Thomas Parkhurst. Jonathan Robinson. And John Lawrence, 1702); Sir Philip Warwick, *Memoires of the reigne of King Charles I* (London: printed for Ri. Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1701).

[84] Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS J Walker, c[entury] 1 and c[entury] 2.

[85] Ann Laurence, '"This Sad and Deplorable Condition:" An attempt towards recovering an account of the sufferings of Northern clergy families in the 1640s and 1650s" in Diana Wood (ed.), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church c. 1000 – c. 1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross* (Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical

Naturally, there are very many private and public settings, story-tellers and stories about the civil wars and Interregnum which circulated through English society after 1660 that cannot be examined in a work of this length. Hundreds of sermons were delivered in the late Stuart period which grappled with the meaning of the mid-century troubles, and particularly the death of Charles I.[86] Balladeers, poets and playwrights narrated the ruptured past in allegories and allusions; pamphleteers likewise laced their arguments with anecdotes or images from those times.[87] Large repositories of late seventeenth-century ecclesiastical court records have not yet been mined for what they might reveal

---

History Society, Boydell Press, 1999), 465-88; and "'Begging pardon for all mistakes or errors in this writing I being a woman and doing it myself:" Family narratives in some eighteenth-century letters' in James Daybell (ed.) *Early Modern Women's Letter-Writing, 1450-1700* (London: Palgrave, 2001), 194-206; G. B. Tatham, *Dr John Walker and* The Sufferings of the Clergy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911); Burke Griggs, 'Remembering the Puritan Past: John Walker and Anglican Memories of the English Civil War,' in M.C. McClendon, J.P. Ward, and M. MacDonald (eds.), *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 158-191. John Walker, *An attempt towards recovering an account of the numbers and suffering of the clergy of the Church of England ...* (London: J. Nicholson, 1714).

[86] The 30th January Fast Day sermons provided much of the material for Andrew Lacey's analysis of *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003); I look forward to drawing upon the analysis of David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Non-conformity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

[87] Angela McShane Jones, '"Rime and Reason": the political world of the English broadside ballad, 1640-1689' (Coventry: Unpublished PhD thesis, 2004); Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996); Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

about perceptions of the recent past.[88] Much empirical and interpretive work thus remains to be done to understand fully the effect that the 'English Revolution' had on post-Restoration historical culture.

It is clear that the narratives examined below were profoundly shaped by their public contexts, and that these contexts could be challenged and changed by the memories and histories told, and lived, therein. Therefore, by attending to a small portion of the dead who spoke and wrote stories about their experience of troubled times, it is hoped that this study might lead to us to reflect more critically on present discourses about recent experiences of violence and rupture, and to perceive just how many historians are at work telling true stories about the past.[89]

---

[88] For example, testimonies about aspects of the war years within archiepiscopal court 'cause papers,' which concern tithe, matrimonial, church dues, defamation, clerical discipline, and testamentary proceedings; Borthwick Institute for Archives, York, Cause Papers (CP, series E-J).

[89] On the notion of the historian's task as giving countenance to the dead, see Edith Wyschogrod *The Ethics of Remembering: History, Heterology and the Nameless Others* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

II.

Restoration Remembrances: Recollections of a pardonable past in the Answers of defaulting accountants, 1662-1664

This chapter examines a particular collection of civil war and Interregnum memories, the Answers of defaulting accountants, which were profoundly shaped by their political, legal and social contexts. Nonetheless, a careful reading of the language used in these sources indicates that men from across the nation took advantage of the Restoration regime's two approaches to the recent past, oblivion and selective remembering, to reinterpret their own history for personal benefit. Defaulting accountants used the government's own rhetoric about the past to argue that they were presently in no debt to the recently restored king.

*

In the spring of 1663 Major William Norton of Yorkshire found himself compelled by a lawsuit brought against him by the Crown to offer an account of certain actions from his recent past. Major Norton first recalled the service he rendered for the late king 'of blessed memory' Charles I beginning in 1642, including working on the commission of array for York and as receiver of rents for royal properties. He then remembered that his oldest son had raised a horse troop at his own expense for the king's forces, was wounded in the field and later died. The Major's losses did not end there, for next he recounted how his estate was subsequently sequestered by Parliament, and plundered, that he was then forced to compound for it at Goldsmiths Hall in London, and endured a period of imprisonment. Later on Norton was subjected to the decimation tax imposed by the 'late usurpers' as a consequence of being 'in his Judgement and actions according to his ability their utter Enemy.'

Why then was such a man, who had been, as he recalled, 'always loyal and faythfull to his Maj[esty] that now is and to his Royal father deceased' being sued by the Crown? It turned out that there was one event in Major Norton's life which possibly blotted his otherwise spotlessly royalist past. Sometime in 1654, 'as he remembereth,' the Major received a commission commanding him for three months, to collect a tax called the assessment for Oliver Cromwell's government. Despite unwillingness to work for the Protector's regime, and his previously having been deemed a 'delinquent' for his royalist sympathies, Norton learned that 'further mischiefe' was in store for him if refused the commission; so he relented. He appointed one of his servants, Benjamin Purchas, to collect the money assessed and to hand it over to the receiver general for York, Ralph Rymer. As proof, Norton claimed he still possessed several written acquittances and discharges from Rymer, which he could produce if so required. At no other time during the late troubles, Norton concluded, had he ever complied with the 'sayd usurpers in their Government.'[1]

This story told by a chastened and probably bitter old royalist about his record during the civil wars and Interregnum is one of a large collection of documented remembrances of those days which were made in the early 1660s: the Answers of defaulting accountants.[2] These accounts were recorded shortly after the event which most people believed (and hoped) heralded a major new beginning for the country after years of war and political uncertainty; the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.[3] The testimony which generated the Answers was occasioned by the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, which passed the same year. In this law the king granted a general pardon and forgetting of past actions while exempting, after some negotiating with Parliament, particular persons and deeds.[4] This chapter is concerned with the stories told by a particular group of such exempted persons who were defendants before the Court of Exchequer; their testimony as conveyed in an Answer was a 'Restoration remembrance.' [5]

---

[1] The account is drawn from the Answer of Major William Norton, dated April 1663, to a Bill of Complaint brought by the Attorney General, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, to the Court of Exchequer. It is held at the National Archives (TNA), Kew, under E 113/7/1 (Yorkshire).

[2] The 'Bills and Answers of Defaulting Accountants' are part of the Court of Exchequer collection at TNA; my analysis is based on a sample of 180 Answers representing 203 defendants, drawn from thirteen counties in England and Wales.

A 'Restoration Remembrance' was one wherein the Act of Indemnity defined the content of a defendant's public account of his past, and dissociated him from his former work.[6] The foundational legislation of the Restoration process provided defendants with a framework through which they could narrate their past actions as having been pardoned.[7] The recollections conveyed by the defendants' Answers were constrained by national and local political and legal contexts, yet were nonetheless purposeful efforts to re-shape the way a defendant's past was publicly remembered.[8] The stories conveyed by these documents suggest that these men, forced to testify about their former deeds, reformulated their personal history to meet the exigencies of a new political reality. In these narrations of service during the late troubles the monarchy's former enemies, and those who had collaborated with them, were re-fashioned into loyal, obedient, and pardonable subjects.[9]

---

[3] The beginning was understood by many to be, paradoxically, a return to the 'good old form,' and so not really new. For the importance of the term 'restoration' for those who hoped for the recovery of pre-civil war political equilibrium see N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 51; and Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 173-6.

[4] 12 Car. II. c. 11. 'An Act of Free and General Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion' in Great Britain, *The Statutes of the Realm: 1215-1713, Volume V (S.R.* v. hereafter*)*, (London: Dawsons, 1963), 226-35. The most thorough analysis of the Act's legislative genesis remains Paul Seaward's *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 196-213.

[5] For an argument about the practical narrative configuration of actions and events see David Carr, *Time, Narrative and History* (Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press, 1986), 48-51.

[6] For an introduction to the social construction of 'periodization' see Eviatar Zereubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 83.

[7] The notion that the Restoration was an open-ended process which began in 1660 rather than an *accomplishment* is suggested by Keeble in *England in the 1660s*, 3; for Jonathan Scott the process was fundamentally concerned with what he calls, drawing on the work of Paul Connerton, 'public memory,' and only ended when the late troubles disappeared from the public mind; Scott, *England's Troubles*, 393.

After a brief analysis of how the Act of Indemnity prompted the particular recollections of defaulting accountants, this chapter will examine the Answers' legal, formal, and social aspects, the kinds of remembering they convey, the language and materials through which accountants delivered a true and authoritative story, the relationship between time and narrative in Answers, and the ways accountants' recollections were made to fit within a narrative of pardon and indemnity laid out by the statute.

The national political context which most profoundly shaped the testimonies of defendants such as Major Norton was the return of King Charles II in the spring of 1660; the event was greeted by widespread rejoicing throughout England, some of which was perhaps a deliberate effort to forget the previous two decades.[10] The legislative keystone of a political settlement grounded on the 'liquidation of the past, ' the Act of Free and General Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion, was passed by the Convention Parliament later that same year and grudgingly confirmed in 1661 by the 'Cavalier' Parliament.[11] The purpose of the Act was to prevent any repetition of the recent civil upheavals, to 'bury all Seede of future Discorde and remembrance of the former.'[12] It represented an effort by the government to return the realm to certainty and the rule of law by preventing any destabilizing inquisitions into the past, by assuring the monarchy's old enemies (and its new friends, the so-called 'new Cavaliers') that their lives and properties were safe from royalist vengeance, and by lifting the burden of a guilty past from nervous subjects.[13] This was to be achieved by declaring that actions committed between January 1637 until June 1660 which would normally be considered treasonous and criminal were henceforth 'Pardoned Released Indempnified Discharged and put in utter Oblivion.'[14] Also, for the three years following 1660 any reflections in speech or in print on a person's conduct during the late troubles were subject to fines.[15] Consequently, the Act of Indemnity, along with the Act for the Confirmation of Judicial Proceedings, left many old Cavaliers who hoped the Restoration would lead to a settling of scores feeling bitter and resentful.[16]

---

[8] On the need for historians to take note of the social practices surrounding remembering (and writing about) the past see Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3ff.

[9] Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative: Volume III*, Translated by Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 244-48.

[10] Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: OUP, 1985) 113-25; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 52-53; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 2005), 46-56.

---

[11] John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 160; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 70; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 17.

[12] Paulina Kewes, "Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law and National Memory in Early Restoration England" in Lorna Clymer (ed.) *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 109-128.

[13] Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 196; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 76. The 'new Cavaliers' refered to former Parliamentarians and Cromwellians, such as General George Monck, Edward Mountague, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Arthur Annesley, Edward Montagu, and Denzil Holles, whose efforts to restore the king in 1659-60 was rewarded handsomely. The aforementioned men were all given places on Charles II's first Privy Council; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 77ff. See also Anon. *A Lively Portrait of New Cavaliers, Commonly Called Presbyterians*, London: 1661.

[14] *S.R.* v. 226.

[15] *S.R.* v. 230; clauses xxiii and xxiv.

[16] 12 Car. II c. 12. 'Act for the Confirmation of Judicial Proceedings,' *S.R.* v. 233-36; this legislation decreed that no legal decision since 1642 could be declared void because it had been conducted under an illegitimate authority. This meant, for example, that royalists who had had to sell property to compound for fines levied on their estates by Parliament or the Protectorate could not sue for their return. The implications of the Restoration land settlement for later seventeenth century partisan politics was the subject of substantial body of literature, which may be approached first through Joan Thirsk, 'The Restoration land settlement' in *The Journal of Modern History* 26 (1954), 315-28. The most notable declaration of royalist resentment was Roger L'Estrange's *A Caveat to the Cavaliers*, London: 1661,

Yet it is this disappointment which has led historians to argue that the Act was a political success, and that the politics of reconciliation rather than revenge went a long way to stabilizing the realm.[17] Similarly, Charles II's determination to appease his father's enemies, even at cost of appearing to short-change his old friends, deflated the rebellious pretensions of most strident republicans and puritans.[18] Therefore, past adherence or service to the Long Parliament or Interregnum regimes did not automatically exclude men from public life after 1660.

The Crown and Parliament were not prepared, however, to forget and forgive without exception all the deeds committed during the 'long and great Troubles Discords and Warrs.'[19] Most famously, the Act of Indemnity exempted from its general pardon fifty named individuals connected with the execution of King Charles I; the trial and execution of some of the regicides followed in October 1660.[20] Furthermore, land formerly belonging to the Church or the Crown did not have secure title under the Act, and certain public funds collected during the civil wars and Interregnum were exempted from the moratorium on debts and receipts.[21] These funds, which were evoked in many defendants' Answers, included, among others, proceeds from the decimation tax, which had been levied on royalists after Penruddock's revolt in 1655, church tithes, excise tax revenues collected since 1658, money owed for billeting soldiers since July 1659, goods

---

written in response to the (somewhat) special pleading of the future historiographer royal James Howell in his *A Cordial for Cavaliers*, London: 1661.

[17] Hutton, *Restoration*, 133-37; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 213

[18] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 177; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 165.

[19] *S.R.* v. 226.

[20] *S.R.* v. 231-232; clauses xxxiv and xxxv. Keeble argues that the trials of the regicides were, in part, public acts to cleanse the present of surviving authors of the chaotic and troublesome past, *England in the 1660s*, 54-57; for a similar assessment see Howard Nenner, 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660' in Howard Nenner (ed.) *Politics and the Political Imagination in later Stuart Britain: Essays presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, NY: Rochester UP, 1997), 21-42.

[21] J. P. Kenyon (ed.), *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688, Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 370; *S.R.* v. 233, clause xlviii.

and chattels formerly belonging to the royal family, and the accounts of a number of treasurers and receivers of public funds.[22] The Crown wanted to recover any arrears of taxation still in the hands of such 'accountants' not only to strengthen its financial position, but to help pay off the potentially troublesome remnants of the New Model Army and so speed up its disbandment.[23] A statute passed in 1661 clarified the meaning of the exemptions set out in the Act of Indemnity: all revenues collected before 1660 legitimately belonged to the government.[24] That same year (1661) a combination of Crown commissioners appointed by the Court of Exchequer, private commissioners, county assize courts, and parish constables sought out the identity of defaulting accountants.[25] The lists resulting from these searches were the basis for a huge number of law suits brought before the equity side of the Court of Exchequer in 1662-1664, which in turn were the occasion of the defaulting accountants' Answers.[26] Before turning to their content it is necessary briefly to describe the legal context and form of these English language documents.

The Court of Exchequer was a branch of government primarily concerned with the collection of royal revenue, divided into an upper exchequer of audit and lower exchequer of account.[27] The upper exchequer had three jurisdictions, the pleas, the revenue side, and, from the sixteenth century, an equity side.[28] The revenue side of the Exchequer followed common law practices, such as using Latin pleadings and oral evidence, while the equity side modelled itself on the Court of Chancery and used the 'English Bill' procedure, in which the components of the first or 'pleading' stage—complaints, answers, and depositions—were all written down in English before being presented to the court at a subsequent 'proof' stage.[29] By the middle of the seventeenth century it was evidently not uncommon for disputes between the crown and collectors over revenue to be initiated by an English Bill, or to follow equity procedures such as giving evidence by written deposition.[30] It is this practice that appears to explain why causes which concerned the revenue side of the court, the accounts of defaulting interregnum tax collectors, took the form of equity proceedings.[31]

---

[22] *S.R.* v. 231, clause xxxi; 233, clause xliv; clause xxxiii; clause xlvii; 229, clause xvii; 228, clause x.

[23] S. Roberts, 'Public or Private? Revenge and Recovery at the Restoration of Charles II' in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986), 173.

[24] 13 Car. II c. 3; *S. R.* v. 306-7.

[25] Roberts, 'Public or Private?' 179-80.

[26] According to the National Archives 'Green Guide' and on-line catalogue, the materials in 'Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Bills and Answers of Defaulting Accountants' (E113) are equity proceedings on Bills or Informations, *Series List: E112 to E121* (London: Public Record Office, 1985). This class of records is identified with proceedings on the revenue side of the Court of Exchequer in the *Guide to the contents of the Public Record Office: Volume I Legal records* (London: H.M.S.O, 1963), 48.

[27] M. J. Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in Seventeenth-Century England: Local Administration and Response* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 1994), 30.

The proceedings which generated most Answers usually commenced when a plaintiff presented to the court a bill of complaint, at times called the 'Information,' which stated his case and petitioned a judge to hear the suit and do justice.[32] A judicial review of the past thus began with the plaintiff's story; in the cases that concern us the first teller was the crown.[33] The bills against the defaulting accountants were drawn up in the Exchequer court from the lists of names submitted by local searching agents.[34] In essence, the bills claimed that certain persons were exempted from the Act of Indemnity's specific pardon because they had had omitted to turn over money due the government, such as the rents from the estates of sequestered Catholic recusants, for which the defendants were now liable.[35] The individuals named on the bill, known in subsequent documents as defendants, were required by court procedure to give sworn replies to a set of interrogatories arising from it. Their testimony was written down in a document subsequently called an Answer, which was then submitted as evidence during the proof stage of the court's proceedings.[36] Defendants' Answers normally were spoken to and recorded either by a clerk at Westminster or by two county commissioners. In the autumn of 1662 Parliament enacted a statute to streamline the proceedings against defaulting accountants, primarily to minimize fees and to make it easier to link the testimonies with special audits.[37] Thus over the next two years just over seventeen hundred men across England and Wales recalled particular aspects of their actions during the late troubled times, prompted ultimately by legislation designed in the first instance to put those years into oblivion.[38]

---

[28] W.H. Bryson, *The Equity Side of the Court of Exchequer: its jurisdiction and administration, procedures and records* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 9. Equity jurisdictions evolved in the later middle ages from the court of the Lord Chancellor, and were based on a sense of general justice aimed at providing satisfaction to both parties; English common law did not apply in equity courts.

[29] Henry Horwitz, *Equity Records and Proceedings, 1649-1841: Public Record Handbook No. 32* (London: Public Record Office, 2001), 8.

[30] This development derived from 33 Hen. VIII c. 39 which allowed for an equity defence to be pled to common law actions on behalf of the crown on the revenue side of the Exchequer, *S. R.* iii, 891-2; J. H. Manning, *The Practice of the Court of Exchequer: Revenue Branch* (London: A. Strahan, 1827), 188-93; Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation*, 31, 39.

[31] Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation*, 41, and personal correspondence, 10 November 2007.

[32] Bryson, *Equity Side*, 93; Horowitz, *Equity Records*, 20-24. For the typical form of bills of complaint see Sir William S. Holdsworth, *A history of English Law: Volume IX* (London: Methuen, 1926), 379.

[33] This is in contrast to the royal pardons examined by Natalie Zemon Davis in *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Ttellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1987), 14, where the proceedings began with the supplicating subject's story.

Written records of legal testimony are heavily formal and rhetorical, and as such do not give historians a clear channel to the authentic voice of long dead defendants.[39] The court provided particular roles and scripts for participants, whether they approached it as plaintiffs, defendants, witnesses, or commissioners. These documents followed a conventional pattern: Answers were first spoken in reply to the interrogatories, which prescribed what the defendant could relate in his testimony.[40] In other words, the defendant would be called upon to remember only those aspects of the past which related to the points raised by the bill of complaint. Perhaps most significantly, while the defendant delivered his testimony orally from memory, a scrivener or one of the court-appointed commissioners wrote it down.[41] Yet even though the defendant did not have complete control over the written record of his testimony, once the Answer had been drawn up it was to be read back to him to ensure its accuracy.[42] The Answers were also supposed to contain the following components: a denigration of the substance and motivation of the bill of complaint, an alternative account of the facts, and a denial the plaintiff's version of the past.[43] Similar to the sixteenth-century French letters of remission analysed by Natalie Zemon Davis, the Answers may be interpreted as mixed genres: part judicial reply, part historical account, and part narrative.[44] Yet within the legal language and typical form of a written Answer it is possible to perceive aspects of the defendant's spoken testimony about his past. The cooperative efforts that went into transforming defendants' testimony, spoken from memory, into written documents, are themselves reminders that knowledge about the past is shaped both by the context and by the form of its transmission.[45]

---

[34] Roberts, 'Public or Private?' 181.

[35] E113/1 (Brecknockshire), 'Bill of Complaint' against, inter alia, Sir John Thorowgood, Sir Francis West, Francis Cole, Henry Danvers, John Browne, George Cooper, Richard Reed, and Richard Young.

[36] Bryson, *Equity Side*, 114; Horowitz, *Equity Records*, 20. By contrast, in common law courts written testimony was not accepted as evidence.

[37] The answers of many defendants could be taken in their home counties before a single commission made up of local gentry; Roberts, 'Public or Private?' 181; 14 Car. II c. 16, *S.R.* v. 409.

[38] 'E113: Bills and Answers' in *Series List: E112 to E121.*

[39] Christine Churches, '"The Most Unconvincing testimony:" The Genesis and Historical Usefulness of the Country Depositions in Chancery' in *The Seventeenth Century* 11 (1996), 209-27.

---

[40] The exclusive use of masculine pronouns hereafter reflects the gender of the overwhelming majority of defendants and commissioners.

[41] Churches, 'Unconvincing testimony,' 209; Bryson, *Equity Side*, 139.

[42] Horowitz, *Equity Records*, 26.

[43] Bryson, *Equity Side*, 115; Horowitz, *Equity Records*, 20.

[44] Zemon Davis, *Fiction*, 4, 23.

[45] For a reflection on the testimonial basis of document-driven historiography see Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 147. From a phenomenological perspective it is possible also to understand the Answers of

Along with their political and legal contexts, the Answers originated from specific local milieu, such as the relations between plaintiff, defendants, and commissioners.[46] Clearly the fact that the plaintiff was the newly restored monarchical government, and that most defendants were collaborators with, if not outright supporters of, its enemies, loomed over all that was remembered, spoken, and recorded. The tone and content of a defendant's reply to a bill of complaint originating from the crown, for example, was probably different in tone and content from one coming from his neighbour. The defendant's social status and education also affected the nature of his testimony; as we shall see below, many defendants from the 'better sort' had the shortest Answers. Some Answers declared the defendant's title or estate, while others do not: whether this was noted at the speaker's request or was simply a matter of form that was occasionally missed is unclear from the documents themselves. For example, the answers of one group of defendants from Worcestershire included each speaker's status or occupation: Abraham Plimley, weaver, John Hill, baker, and Fulke Estopp, gentleman.[47] By contrast, a group of Answers given by a cohort of defendants from Cambridgeshire simply noted each man's name.[48]

The over-riding goal of social peace among both the better and lesser 'sorts,' was almost certainly factors in determining which men were compelled by a bill of complaint to testify about their actions during the troubled times to the Exchequer court's

---

defaulting accountants as images of the absent remembering and speaking human being, making present what was at one time recalled, spoken, and written down; *Ibid*., 235.

[46] The need for historians to take note of the social practices surrounding remembering (and writing about) the past is powerfully articulated by an anthropologist of West African cultures, Elizabeth Tonkin, in *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3ff; Churches, 'Unconvincing testimony,' 224.

[47] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): Abraham Plimley, John Hill, Fulke Estopp, January 1662.

[48] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): John Wright, William Crud, Stephen Horton, and Joseph Cole, April 1663.

commissioners.[49] The political views, and past careers, of the commissioners were themselves also no doubt important. For example, a recent student of the proceedings has argued that the rosters of the commissions were designed so as not to stir up pre-Restoration antagonisms.[50] A defendant who had been 'purged' from an administrative post, such as customs collector, after the Restoration was perhaps not so much the victim of a vindictive monarchy as a casualty of its prodigal distribution of patronage.[51] Without a prosopographical analysis of the pre- and post-Restoration careers of commissioners and defendants the political reasons certain men; and not others, had to testify must remain a mystery. What is not in doubt, however, is that in numerous cases the defendants were telling their stories in relatively public venues.

Testimony before the commissioners was sometimes given in an open setting, which permitted what one student of the proceedings calls 'a controlled but public airing of past events.'[52] Defendants in Glamorganshire, for example, including William Lewis, Watkind Richard, and Bussy Mansel were deposed at 'houses' which probably were inns.[53] Such relatively open testifying was not typical for English Bill procedures, since Answers and depositions normally were spoken to a commissioner and a scrivener in private, and became public only during the proof stage of the case when they were read out to the court.[54] By contrast, defaulting accountants could be required to recall and speak about their past before members of the community who had lived through many of the same events together.[55] The defendants were thus testifying within the hearing of people who possessed 'common memories' about what had happened during the wars, and that what they said could be subject to dispute and contradiction by their listeners.[56]

---

[49] On the concern among both 'high' and 'low' for peace and order see Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 9-13; the imperative for local harmony is outlined by Craig Muldrew in 'The Culture of Reconciliation: Community and the Settlement of Economic Disputes in Early Modern England' in *Historical Journal* 39 (1996), 915-42; Roberts contends that the commissions for defaulting accountants aimed simply to recover arrears of taxation while minimising local tensions, 'Public or Private?' 181.

[50] Roberts, 'Public or Private?' 182.

[51] On the 'Restoration Spoils of Patronage' see Stephen K. Roberts, *Recovery and Restoration in an English County: Devon Local Administration, 1646-1670* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1985), 138-146. There were certainly powerful underlying elements, such as the micro-politics of local administration during the Interregnum, which went into the compound which emerged as a defendant's 'final' Answer that will not receive sustained analysis here. For an example of a study which uses the Answers of defaulting accountants to explore the local instantiation of national political divisions after the Restoration, with particular reference to Devonshire, see Roberts, 'Public or Private?' *passim*.

[52] Roberts, 'Public or Private?' 186.

[53] E113/2 (Glamorganshire): William Lewis of Afan, at the house of Hopking Morgan, Neath, January 1663; Watkin Richard, taken at Lewis Matthew's house, Bridgend, January 1663; Bussy Mansel of Briton Ferry at house of Margaret Love, Neath, January 1663. I owe these references to Stephen Roberts.

The public nature of the occasion, and the reciprocal expectations of speaker and knowing audience, would have certainly impinged upon the content of a defendant's testimony, and his demeanour during his hearing.[57] Another important factor was whether he spoke only for himself, as in the case of William Hussey of Wiltshire, or as part of a group.[58] Several defendants cited by the same bill might testify before the commission on the same day, or within a few days of each other. For example, Roger Rowley, Henry Gosnell, and Richard Bagot, also from Wiltshire, had their hearing together in January 1663.[59] In such cases there is the possibility that the defendants cooperated beforehand to get each of their accounts 'straight.' The level of cooperation would certainly have been affected by the state of relations between them at the time, and their respective attitudes toward the Restoration regime—those having made their peace with the royal government perhaps were keen to place the blame for their actions on others. Knowing that co-defendants would hear one's testimony, and might later contradict it in their own Answer, would have been another crucial factor in a man's mind as he spoke. In many cases the accounts of two or more persons were entered onto one Answer. The testimony of London-area defendants Henry Edmonds, Richard Parme, John Norbury and nine other men was inscribed onto one Answer, as were the responses of Valentine Pearse and Daniel Sell of Cambridgeshire, and Anthony and William Garforth of Keighley near York.[60] Such defendants were thus narrating together aspects of their common past, and so their joint Answer perhaps deserves to be understood as a shared story resulting from collective memory.

---

[54] Bryson, *Equity Side*, 139.

[55] E113/3 (Glamorganshire): William Jones of Swansea gave his answer at the house of a minor gentry figure, Leyshon Seys, January 1663, which Stephen Roberts infers meant that it was heard in private.

[56] Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 51.

[57] On the significance of the 'occasion' in oral discourses about the past see Tonkin, *Narrating our Pasts*, 52-58; and Ulla-Maija Peltonen, 'The Return of the Narrator' in Anne Ollila (ed.) *Historical Perspectives on Memory* (Helsinki: SHS-Finnish Historical Society, 1999), 136. The importance of socially prescribed roles for the presentation of the self and constraining human interaction is articulated in the work of Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin, 1990), and *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* (New York: Pantheon, 1982). For an application of Goffman's theory to early modern English local politics see Michael Braddick's 'Administrative performance: the representation of political authority in early modern England' in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (eds.) *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 166-187.

[58] E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): William Hussey, November 1662.

[59] E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): Henry Gosnell; Richard Bagot; Roger Rowley; January 1663.

The Answers of defaulting accounts were therefore the end product of individual and joint acts of remembrance, which were spoken and written down within highly structured political, legal, and social contexts. They are a very particular written genre, based on personal and collective remembering, and public oral testimony;[61] they were also deliberate efforts to give a particular meaning to actions committed in the recent past which the crown wished to exempt from the government's policy of reconciliation and forgetting. A bill of complaint from the crown narrated a defendant's past deeds which provoked a counter remembrance from him. A bill and an Answer were more or less public stories about the troubled times which, as we shall see below, largely concerned public accounts. The chapter now turns to the content of these tales of taxation during the troubles, and in particular to their rhetorical features.

---

[60] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Henry Edmonds et al. November 1662; E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Valentine Pearse and Daniel Sell, November 1662; E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Anthony Garforth and William Garforth of Sleeton and Michael Wooller, May 1663.
[61] A. Portelli, 'Oral History as Genre' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson (eds.) *Narrative and Genre* (London: Routledge, 1998), 25.

Most of the Answers examined contained blanket denials of the contents of the bill, what I will call 'negative remembering,' or else a combination of denials and confessions or acknowledgements, which can be labelled 'positive remembering.' Negative remembering in an Answer suggests that a defendant or defendants replied with a 'no' to all interrogatories: he or they had nothing to say about the past beyond asserting that the account conveyed by the Crown's bill was untrue. Speaking on his own behalf in November 1662, Henry Saxton of Yorkshire simply denied all the material in the bill of complaint, as did Isaac King the same month in Cambridgeshire.[62] The thirteen gentleman defendants from Middlesex who together replied to a charge of retaining money from appropriated tithes, including Henry Edmonds, John Norbury, and Abraham Nelson, 'singlely and severally' denied that the contents of the Crown's bill were true.[63] Another gentleman from the same county, John Ash, testified that he had never received any public monies whatsoever, while Robert Bellamy 'absolutely' denied ever levying or receiving any bonds from the premises mentioned in the bill.[64] John Davis and Henry Oasland of Worcestershire were named as co-conspirators on the same bill, and gave their answers at the same time, yet while the latter did acknowledge his part in the maintenance of a preaching minister at Bewdley chapel, the former was satisfied to disavow any connection with the actions mentioned in the bill.[65] Oasland, it should be noted, had been briefly imprisoned in 1661 on suspicion of his involvement in an alleged Presbyterian rising, and was ejected from his clerical position at Bewdley on Bartholomew's Day 1662.

---

[62] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Henry Saxton, November 1662; E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Isaac King, November 1662.
[63] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Henry Edmonds et al., November 1662.
[64] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): John Ash, January 1663; Robert Bellamy, November 1662.
[65] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): John Davis, January 1663; Henry Osland, January 1663; C. D. Gilbert, 'Oasland, Henry (bap. 1625, d. 1703)' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press,

These Answers show that it was possible for some of the King's subjects to refuse outright the demand conveyed by the bill of complaint to remember the recent past. That is to say, some men would not speak about their former deeds in their Answer apart from saying that the government's account of them was completely wrong.[66] It may be that these refusals to remember reflected the reality that the defendants really had done none of the things contended in the Crown's bill, and further researches into their Interregnum service records might indeed show this to be the case.[67] Whatever the reasons for the unwillingness of a number of alleged defaulting accountants to offer any positive testimony about their actions in former days, that is, to provide a counter-narrative to the contents of the bill of complaint, their Answers show that while they remembered their former deeds in their minds, they were not about to speak about them with their own voice, even at the Crown and court's behest. They remembered what they had done in the past but chose to restrict their testimony about it to denials of falsehoods. While it is not possible to infer from the Answers what exactly motivated blanket negative remembering, it was perhaps a combination of self-preservation and passive resistance to the new regime: to deny the contents of the bill of complaint was at a certain level to

---

2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/20434, accessed 15 Jan 2007].

[66] Thus in a sense these defendents were denying the stories which formed the basis of the bill of complaint, derived from the work of local searching agents such as constables, assize juries, and private commissioners.

[67] Such work has been done on a limited scale by S. Roberts, see his 'Public or Private?' 180-87.

identify it as a lie, and its authors as liars.[68] Negative remembering demonstrated that some parts of a defendant's past had been liquidated not for the sake of public reconciliation but private well-being.

Defendants who rejected the crown's account of their past often did so using the government's own rhetoric, drawn from either the bill of complaint or the Act of Indemnity, as is clear from Rees William's Answer, delivered in February 1663. Over half the document was taken up with the Welshman's denials, for example, that he 'was ever Committee man Commissioner of Sequestration…Receiver or Collector of any publiq money by virtue of any Authorities or pretended Authorities during the time in…the Bills of Information mentioned,' as well as 'the offences of imbezzelling, purloining concealing or conveying away any of the money, goods, plate or jewels of the late king or other members of the royal family.'[69] Similarly, Francis Powell claimed that it was untrue, among other things, that he was 'imployed by any private order or instruction or entrusted nor [did] ever undertake the employment to receive any money for the kings service that now is since the year 1648.'[70] That Williams and Powell, or the numerous other defendants whose Answers contain almost identical statements, ever actually spoke such words, which echoed the bill brought against them, is very doubtful. Rather, they were almost certainly transcribed from the interrogatories to which the defendant gave a negative answer.

---

[68] It would be interesting to know if these defendants were evincing what Zerubavel calls 'mnemonic myopia,' a phenomena in which people chose to forget everything that happened before a particular moment in time, in these cases 1660. The Answers do not in themselves confirm or deny this interpretation; Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 92. A modern example of this phenomenon is the tendency among some Germans to regard 1945 as *Stunde Null*, or 'zero hour,' as the beginning of time worth remembering.
[69] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): R. William, February 1663.
[70] E113/1 (Glamorganshire): Francis Powell, February 1663.

A number of defendants testified partly through the language of the Act of Indemnity. For example, a collector from Strafforth and Tickhill wapentake in Yorkshire, Anthony Goodwin, suggested that the king's 'harty and pious desire to putt an end to all suits and controversies that by [reason] of the late distractions which have risen or may arise between his Subjects,' outlined in the Act's preamble, meant Goodman ought to be acquitted and discharged from having to account for the money he had received while in that office.[71] One of the chief constables and sequestration agents in the wapentake of Staincliffe, Yorkshire, John Lupton, reminded the court that, among the provisions of the Act (clause xi) it was declared that 'no accomptant then living shall be liable to make accompt of any summe or summes of money paid or disbursed or otherwise allowed or discharged by virtue or colour of any order or ordinance of both or either houses of Parliament.'[72] George Harrington cited the same clause in his Answer, as well as the subsequent proviso that 'noe person nor persons shall be charged for Moneys by him received for the Fees and Salaries and Wages then allowed.'[73] While his Answer quoted the letter of the Act, in particular, clause xiv exempting all offences in detaining the late king's goods, Henry Carter contended that his selling off parts of the royal collection of paintings was 'as he humbly conceiveth according to the true meaning of the said Act of General Pardon thereby intended to be pardoned.'[74] In other words, Carter interpreted his past actions as not falling outside the Act's provisions.

Positive remembering in an Answer began where the language was drawn from neither the bill of compliant nor the Act of Indemnity. That is to say, when the language of an Answer shifts from that which is recognizably drawn from the bill of complaint or the Act of Indemnity, it probably thereafter represents a defendant's oral testimony, which was in turn derived from his personal memory.[75] Positive remembering about a defendant's past usually began with rhetorical signals such as 'this defendant saith that…,' 'this defendant confesseth that…' or, less frequently, 'this defendant acknowledgeth that….' These phrases served as a boundary marker within his Answer, separating what was a true account of the past, the defendant's own, from the crown's false one. In a portion of the Answers the defendant's account started very near the beginning of the document, or shortly after a few clauses of negative remembering. Following a denial that he ever was a Committee man, a farmer of royal revenues, an overseer of sequestered estates, or a collector of any customs or subsidies, Edward David of Llanigon parish, Brecknockshire, 'confessed' that he had levied and received money as a poll collector.[76] A yeoman from Reigate in Surrey, John Lyfe started his Answer by saying that he had twice been a Chief Collector for Parliament's war tax called the 'assessment,' and then subsequently proceeded to deny at great length the particulars of the bill.[77] Other defendants preferred to save their own true story until they had denied the veracity of the bill's account, as in the joint Answer of former assessment collectors

---

[71] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Anthony Goodwin, January 1663.
[72] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): John Lupton, May 1663.
[73] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): George Harrington, December 1662.
[74] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Henry Carter, November 1662.

---

[75] Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, 235.

[76] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): Edward David, January 1662.

[77] E113/13/3 (Surrey): John Lyfe, July 1663. Parliament introduced the assessment in the summer of 1643 in the wake of its failure to garner sufficient voluntary contributions for its army. It was essentially a progressive income tax that was locally administered and levied, at first weekly, and then monthly, on all counties but not on the city of London; Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation*, 127-34. See also Ian Gentles, 'Parliamentary politics and the politics of the street: the London peace campaigns of 1642-43' in *Parliamentary History* (forthcoming). I am grateful to Prof. Gentles for permission to read a proof of his article.

George Wright and William Masterman of Yorkshire.[78] Likewise, in the spring of 1663 a recently resigned lecturer from Worcestershire, Richard Baxter, began his Answer by declaring that the charges against him were 'groundless and without colour of truth.' He then denied the particulars of the bill, for example, that he had ever been a Trustee for appropriated tithes. The transition to positive remembering occurred near the very end of his Answer with the phrase 'save only:' thereafter Baxter admitted that as the lecturer at Kidderminster during the Interregnum he had received the tithes which were due to the sequestered incumbent, one George Dance.[79]

A defendant became both an author and an authority when he no longer testified and remembered primarily through texts written by others. His authoritative account about the past was built around three key words, knowledge, remembrance, and belief. To speak about a past event or fact from one's knowledge or remembrance was to use the rhetoric of certain knowledge to invoke the authority of personal experience.[80] Such rhetoric often appeared in the negative remembering sections of Answers. For example, Cornelius Cooke of Surrey declared that 'never to his knowledge' had he received any goods from the royal household, nor had he 'ever to his knowledge' collected any public money.[81] A merchant from Devon, Bernard Sparke, began his Answer with a general denial of the charges in the bill of complaint 'to the uttermost of his knowledge and remembrance.'[82] Such statements could also give the speaker's Answer a degree of flexibility, suggesting that he could not speak about the past with as much certainty as he might.[83] A defendant might also 'know' and 'remember' specific aspects of his testimony. The amount John March received in payment for his work collecting arrears of rents from former Crown lands was exactly £72 5s 6d 'to the best of [his] knowledge or remembrance;' Johne Crooke and Nicholas Anderson used that phrase similarly to certify the total sums they had received over four years as sequestrators.[84] As William Vaughan 'remembereth it,' Sir Francis Fane compounded for his delinquency one day in July 1652, which meant that Vaughn had then handed over the tithes of Llanfinhangel Cwmdu parish to Richard Griggs instead of to the sequestrator William Jones.[85]

---

[78] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): George Wright and William Masterman, May 1663. The latter insisted he had nothing to do with anything mentioned in the bill, and suggested that his name was 'entered therein by some mistake onely.'

[79] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): Richard Baxter, May 1663. After his return to Kidderminster from working as a chaplain in Parliament's army Baxter was offered but refused the position of vicar in place of the sequestered George Dance, and instead agreed to take up his old place as lecturer. The parishioners nonetheless secured his appointment as vicar in 1648, not revealing this to him until three years later. Baxter allowed Dance to remain in the vicarage and collect an allowance of £40 per year; N. H. Keeble, 'Baxter, Richard (1615-1691)' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/1734, accessed 15 March 2007]

[80] The rhetorical connection in testimony about the past between 'knowing' and direct personal experience is noted in Maria J. V. Branco's study of collective remembering within a medieval dispute over ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 'Memory and truth: the strange case of the witness enquiries of 1216 in the Braga-Toledo dispute' *Historical Research*, 79 (February 2006), 12.

Defendants would use the terms 'believe' and 'remember,' the rhetoric of confident knowledge, when they wished to indicate that what they said about the past was based on the testimony of others, or when speaking about past events which they were confident, if not absolutely certain, had happened.[86] As far as Anthony Goodwin 'was informed and doth verily believe,' the gentleman to whom he paid in the wapentake of Strafforth's six-months' assessment of just over £727 in 1653, had been 'appointed and authorized' as Receiver General for Yorkshire by the House of Commons.[87] The full purchase price for a royal estate in Worcestershire called Bewdly Park had been paid by one Godfrey Ellis to the Parliamentary trustees responsible for the sale of such lands, as John Davis 'hath heard and doth believe.'[88] The moneys that Robert Sprague received from time to time as a Marshall for the Parliamentary Committee of Devon 'were as [he] believeth usually laid out within a shorte tyme after the receipt thereof.'[89] In 1655 an agent of Devon's commission for ejecting scandalous ministers, David Owen, was to account to that body for the rent paid to him by James Revell for the vicarage of Coffinswell, which Revell 'believed he did accordingly.'[90] The Earl of Manchester's commission, dating from 1643, authorizing William Crud and Stephen Horton of Cambridgeshire to sequester the estates of local known delinquents, was still, as Crud 'beleeveth,' in Horton's possession.[91]

---

[81] E113/13/3 (Surrey): Cornelius Cooke, May 1663.
[82] E113/6 (Devonshire): Bernard Sparke, January 1663.
[83] I am grateful to Lesley Cormack for pointing this out to me.
[84] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): John March, November 1662; E113/7/1/ (York): John Crooke and Nicholas Anderson, October 1662.
[85] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): William Vaughan, January 1663.
[86] This is similar to the practice of the witnesses in the thirteenth-century inquisition over the jurisdiction of the dioceses of Braga discussed by Branco in 'Memory and Truth,' 12.

A defendant's denial of the crown's account of his past was based on personal knowledge and the testimony of others, both of which were derived ultimately from his recollections of his experience, and what he remembered hearing about those days from others. Such memories were conveyed in rhetoric that attempted to enhance the credibility of the defendant's testimony. Yet numerous defaulting accountants did not rely upon rhetoric alone to bolster the veracity of their stories, for scattered throughout many Answers there are recurring references to surviving documents which seconded and certified the defendant's recollection. For example, William Steele insisted that 'the several summes hereafter mentioned' which he had collected during Cromwell's rule were the complete amount 'as by the acquittances thereof to which this defendant refers himself may appear.'[92] The tithe of a parcel of Llandyfalle parish which Lewis Walter and John Morgan collected back in 1650 for the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, £33 3s 4d, was paid to one of the Commission's agents 'as appeareth by a receipt thereof had from him under his hand.'[93] A substantial and marvellously precise catalogue of amounts which Samuel Bolton 'collected, gathered, and received' as chief constable of the wapentake of Barkston Ash in Yorkshire during the years 1650 to 1652 is on display in his Answer; Bolton could recall the exact amounts and dates—in 1650 £163 11s 11d and no more—thanks to the several acquittances from the former Receiver-General still in his possession.[94] Valentine Pearse still had the receipts of his rent payments, dating from 1647, for the rectory at Witcham in Cambridgeshire; while Francis Wren, a Receiver General in county Durham from 1650 to 1655, had documents from the Treasurer at War which proved all the monies he collected while in that office were indeed turned over.[95]

---

[87] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Anthony Goodwin, January 1663. A wapentake was a subdivision of certain shires, including Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, and Nottinghamshire, which corresponded to a 'hundred' of other counties.
[88] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): John Davis, January 1663.
[89] E113/6 (Devonshire): Robert Sprague, October 1662.
[90] E113/6 (Devonshire): James Revel, January 1663.
[91] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): William Crud, April 1663.

The number of Answers in which defendants referred to papers from the civil wars and Interregnum era still in their possession—humble lay people such as Valentine Pearse, regional officials such as Samuel Bolton, and servants of the central government in London, as in the case of William Steele—are significant evidence that a 'desire to document' past actions existed among both the greater and lesser sort in mid seventeenth century England. This confirms the argument that this period witnessed within both

---

[92] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): William Steele, October 1662.
[93] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): Walter Lewis, January 1663.
[94] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Samuel Bolton, January 1663.
[95] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Valentine Pearse, November 1662; E113/15/3 (County Durham): Thomas Delavell and Francis Wren, October 1662.

'high' and 'low' culture an increasing recourse to 'memory on paper,' that is, to the widespread use of writing to record information that could in the future act as a kind of material testimony about the past.[96] Whether the men who kept their receipts and acquittances relating to their services for Parliament, Commonwealth, or Protectorate (or all three) for just such an occasion as the crown's proceedings against them after the Restoration is unknowable. It does seem rather probable, however, that defendants, and their auditors—both in the sense of those listening to their testimony and those checking their figures in account books—believed the best account they could submit was one in which written traces of past deeds certified an oral testimony based on memory. When narrating a tale largely centred around money, as the defaulting accountants were compelled to do, many deemed it in their best interest to illustrate its truth with written proofs, that is, inscriptions demonstrating that the story was based on done deeds or the 'facts.'[97]

That the majority of defendants believed that oral testimony was more credible when bolstered by material evidences from the past is clear from the significant number of Answers in which those who did not have surviving documents at hand felt obliged to explain why this was so. A member of Westminster's sequestration committee, John

---

[96] Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England: 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 259-97. On the effect of print in the memorial culture of early modern English lawyers, decreasing the profession's 'collective memory burden' while weighing down the individual's, see Richard J. Ross, "The Memorial Culture of Early Modern English Lawyers: Memory as Keyword, Shelter, and Identity, 1560-1640" *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities* 10 (1998), 267-72. The development of cartography in this period is arguably linked to an increasing reliance on maps as material witnesses to distant (and so absent) spaces; for example, see Peter Barber's 'England II: Monarchs, Ministers, and Maps, 1550-1625' in David Buisseret (ed.) *Monarchs, Ministers and Maps* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 57-98. On the testimonial basis of much geographic knowledge in later seventeenth-century Britain see C. Withers, 'Reporting, Mapping, Trusting: making geographical knowledge in the late seventeenth century,' *Isis* 90 (1999), 498-516.

[97] The legal notion of a 'fact' as an action proved to have occurred (that is, probably done) in the past, is outlined by Barbara Shapiro in *The Culture of Fact: Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).

Jackson, claimed that thirteen years previously he had drawn up an account of the revenues he had collected, which he had then turned over to the committee's solicitor, Mr Charles Ghest. Unhappily for Jackson, Ghest 'went longe since into forraign parts beyond the seas unknown to [Jackson], where he hath ever since remained.'[98] John Beauchamp could not say how much money he had received for Parliament's army at Worcester in 1646 and 1647 because his written account remained with the city's garrison and 'att such tyme as his Majesty with his Army entered that city in the month of September [1651] were by the said Army or by the Army under the command of Oliver Cromwell…plundered and destroyed.'[99] Also blaming the shifting tides of the wars for his dearth of material evidence was a treasurer from Huntingdonshire, Richard Weaver. He claimed that when the King's forces arrived in his county in 1645 they extorted from him the portion of the assessment not yet handed in to Parliament, and consequently many of his acquitances were 'lost or mislaid.'[100] Revealing a penchant for thrift, the former Receiver-General for Yorkshire, Ralph Rymer, remembered that all his bonds or obligations not turned over to the county's Commissioners for the Militia 'hee ...did afterwards use them for wast[e] paper and none of them now remain in the hands of him[self].'[101] And combining an explanation for his lack of documentary evidence with a demonstration of his concern for the commissioners' time, William Barnes acknowledged that during his decade of service as a customs collector for Dartmouth (1645-1654), he had written up bills of exchange and receipts, but now no longer had all these documents by him, and 'to express the particulars thereof would bee a matter too tedious [and] not fit for the trouble of this hon[ourable] court.'[102]

---

[98] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): John Jackson, July 1662.

[99] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): John Beauchamp, November 1662.

[100] E113/5/1 (Huntingdonshire): Richard Weaver, December 1663.

[101] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Ralph Rymer, February 1663. It is possible that Rymer was the same person identified by Andrew Hopper as the wealthiest rebel executed in the failed Northern Rising of 1663, see 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire' *Historical Journal* 45 (2002), 286.

In a number of Answers where defendants could not supplement their testimony with documents, a rhetoric of optimistic knowledge could be employed to suggest that his memory was nonetheless sufficiently trustworthy. For example, Anthony Carles, who had served as a subordinate commissioner for levying and collecting Parliament's excise tax on beer in Worcester from the autumn of 1646 until the end of the following year, 'to the best of [his] knowledge and no longer.' Although Carles insisted that he always paid the money he received to the Commission for the Excise in London, and had exhibited a 'true and just account in wrighting' to that same body, exactly how much he had collected during those years he did not know, nor did he possess the means to 'call the same to remembrance.' This was due to the fact that towards the end of his tenure the office of the excise at Worcester was 'together with other goods plundered and taken away by a rude multitude of people then unlawfully assembled together.'[103]

Testifying from memory alone, however, also revealed that certain aspects of some defendants' past had passed out of memory because of the passage of time. Numerous men claimed they could not remember the sums of money they had collected. For example, James Whinnell stated that the Parliamentary Governor of the Isle of Ely, Henry Ireton, had 'carried away several writings of [Whinnell's] which concerned the sumes of money that [he] had received for Sequestration which [he] could never get again,' and it 'being above 18 years since and his papers concerning the same being taken away as aforesaid' he no longer remembered how much he had received.[104] It was perhaps with some regret that Robert Sprague admitted that he accounted for his expenses and fees as a Marshall for Parliament's Devonshire committee twice a month 'by word of mouth,' which meant that he could not write out any account of the sums he had received 'the same being acted and done more then thirteen years since.'[105] A chief constable in Penkelly Hundred in Brecknockshire, from 1643 to 1644, Richard Watkin could 'not remember' the several sums of money he had received, nor could Gabriel Martin recall the amounts he took in as treasurer for Parliament's committee for Wiltshire between 1647 and 1648.[106] Formerly a collector on behalf of royalist forces in Shropshire, Henry Gosnell confessed that he could not speak with precision about his accounts, since he was 'an old and aged person (viz) above three score and sixteen years of age and very much troubled with the Palsye whereby his memorie is much weakened and impaired.'[107] Defendants also confessed to difficulties recalling the identity of other officials, and even to the length of their holding office. The names of the collectors for Hampshire whom Richard Moore oversaw while treasurer for Basingstoke 'he now remembereth not,' it 'being now about eighteen years since.'[108] Similarly, Richard Weaver could not 'possibly remember' the names of the royalist collectors who had extorted part of Huntingdonshire's assessment back in 1645.[109] Four joint defendants from Somerset each were unable to remember with 'certainty' the time they worked as sequestrators or collectors in the 1640s and 1650s, 'it being soe long of since' as one of them, William Hewlett, noted.[110]

---

[102] E113/6 (Devonshire): William Barnes, November 1662. He had also twice served as mayor of the town and civic receiver; Roberts, *Recovery and Restoration*, 92, 142.
[103] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): Anthony Carles, December 1662.

---

[104] E113/5/ (Cambridgeshire): James Whinnell, November 1662.
[105] E113/6 (Devonshire): Robert Sprague, October 1662.
[106] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): Richard Watkin, January 1663; E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): Gabriel Martin, December 1662.
[107] E113/15/2 (Wiltshire/Salop): Henry Gosnell, January 1663.
[108] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Richard Moore, April 1663.
[109] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Francis Harvey, February 1663; E113/5/1 (Huntingdonshire): Richard Weaver, December 1663.

It was no doubt in the interest of many defendants to point out that the passage of time had reduced their capacity to recall the amount of monies they had collected and disbursed, to whom they paid them, and when. Their forgetfulness could be further justified by the tumultuous nature of the previous two decades, which had made the preservation of material traces of their work extremely difficult. Nonetheless, these examples of gaps in personal memory and the documentary record might not have been simply rhetorical strategies for self-preservation. Similar difficulties remembering and finding written records were evinced before 1660 by people with a stake in presenting accurate recollections of war-related financial transactions. For example, just after the first civil war Parliament set about compensating communities who had billeted their soldiers.[111] The leading inhabitants of Hulcott in Buckinghamshire had difficulty answering Parliament's interrogatories concerning the cost they incurred hosting its troops, complaining that they could not be 'reasonably supposed, that any Parish, or person, should be carefull to preserve their acquittance on almost any Accompt of their disbursements of this nature, since these troublesome times.'[112] Defaulting accountants who confessed to losing documents and forgetting amounts and names therefore were not necessarily dissembling or lying, but rather acknowledging the power of time to erase written and remembered traces of the past. It is thus appropriate to explore briefly the perception of time's passing as conveyed in Answers.

---

[110] E113/13/1 (Somerset): Thomas Allen, John Amory, William Hallet, George Wrentmoore and Thomas Wrentmoore, January 1663. John Amory, 'very well remembered' passing on a good account of the money he had collected to the county's subcommittee.

[111] For a description of the this process see D. H. Pennington, 'The Cost of the English Civil War' in *History Today* 8 (1958), 126-33.

[112] TNA SP 28/42/Part ii, f. 268: Answers of the Inhabitants…of Hoscett. I am grateful to Prof. Blair Worden for bringing these materials to my attention.

Since early modern people could possess very different perceptions of the passage of time, some English courts were prepared to accept a degree of chronological uncertainty in what was understood to be true testimony.[113] For example, Nicholas Conyers confessed that while a soldier he and a few other persons had bought land in Rosedale formerly belonging to the Queen and that since the 'happy restauration of his Sacred Majesty' he had not received any rents from that property. He did not say, however, when he had purchased the estate.[114] It was quite common in Answers, such as Robert Bellamy's, made up of negative remembering, in other words, lacking an account of a defendant's past, not to contain any dates at all.[115] Answers that did convey a defendant's story often hedged dates with modifying phrases such as 'in or about' or 'thereabouts.' Thus William Horne had first received a warrant to gather the assessment in the West Riding, Yorkshire 'in or about the moneth of July in the year [1655],' while three ex-sequestrators from Huntingdon served from the summer of 1643 for 'four years then next following or thereabouts and no longer.'[116] Other defendants hung their accounts on relatively precise dates; James Edwards stated that he accounted for ten months' assessment for two hundreds in Cambridgeshire on 'the twentieth day of February [1644].'[117] Most defendants marked the dates of their term of service according to the secular calendar, yet several, whether by choice or habit, recounted their pasts within the liturgical cycle. Once a treasurer and collector for the southern part of the isle of Ely, Jonas Dench stated that he began this work, which lasted 'the space of four years…or thereabouts,' sometime 'in or about the Feast of St Michael the Archangel in the yeare [1644].'[118] In some instances such chronological exactness might have enhanced the credibility of his account. Nonetheless, it is unclear from the Answers whether the use of dates reflected a defendant's ability or willingness to relate his tenure to the calendar.

---

[113] Furthermore, judgements were often rendered upon a publicly acknowledged occurrence of an event, rather than its exact time or date; Daniel Woolf, 'The Subjective Experience of Time,' (Unpublished paper, 2006), 24-26; I am grateful to Prof. Woolf for permission to read this essay.

[114] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Nicholas Conyers, January 1663.

[115] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Robert Bellamy, November 1662. This is an understandable since there are no stories without beginnings, middles, or ends; Carr, *Time, Narrative and History*, 48-51.

[116] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): William Horne, January 1663; E113/5/1 (Huntingdon): John Pelton, John Offley and Robert Ingram, October 1663.

[117] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): James Edwards, February 1663.

The Answers also suggest that many defendants either did not, or chose not to recall and narrate in a strictly chronological order from an over-arching present-centred perspective.[119] One example of such a 'back-and-forth,' or paratactic, account was the Answer of John Games of Brecknockshire: he first confessed to receiving the tithes of several sequestered parishes in 1653, amounting to £260, and then to collecting the rents of Edward Winter's sequestered lands in the year 1657, which totalled £36. Thereafter Games admitted to taking over the lease for the rectory of Llanfinhangel Cwmdu and four other parishes for the term of seven years beginning in 1653, which he followed with declaration concerning receipt of the tithes of Llanhamlach parish for 1659, and putting up a bond for payment toward the prebend of Llangamarch back in 1653.[120] It is possible that Games's testimony simply reflected the sequence of interrogatories, or that in the course of his deposition he called to mind other aspects of his Interregnum service. The supralinear inscriptions on some Answers might be the result of defendant's choosing to testify about more aspects of their past. For example, Thomas Porter's Answer focussed largely on his twelve-month term as an assessment collector in Worcestershire beginning 3 September 1648; that he had taken up similar work prior to that date was inscribed above the statement concerning his expenses as a collector, wherein his account moved back in time to 1643 when he was High Constable of Bromsgrove and had collected money for Parliament's army.[121] Similarly, on Sir Thomas Lyddell's Answer there was a sentence in which he admitted that he had purchased leases (he did not say when) from the late powers, assigned to the manors of Ravensworth and Lamesley in County Durham, 'heretofore payable to the Crowne,' which he had retained until the king's restoration; this phrase was written above the line denying that he had ever received any rents or tithes as alleged in the bill of complaint.[122]

---

[118] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Jonas Dench, April 1663. Thomas Delavell claimed that he and Anthony Pearson had indeed accounted for rents and profits of sequestered estates in county Durham which they had received from February 1649 to 'the feast of St Martin the Bishop in winter;' E113/15/3 (County Durham): Thomas Delavell and Francis Wren, October 1662.

[119] Shelley Errington, 'Some Comments on Style in the Meanings of the Past' *Journal of Asian Studies* 38 (1979): 231-244.

[120] The term 'paratactic,' used notably by Erich Auerbach in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by William R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 70-75, refers to accounts in which statements are joined without attempts to connect their content, as was the case in chronicles. Furthermore, in such stories the sequence does not match chronology and there is no over-arching present-centred perspective from which to orient the temporal relationship between the story and

Defendants often borrowed from the language of the Act of Indemnity to characterize the nature of the previous two decades. What the statute called 'the long and great Troubles Discorde and Warrs' was echoed in numerous Answers, such as when William Hussey chalked up his forfeiture of several church properties in 1660 with 'his

---

the moment of its telling. E113/1 (Brecknockshire): John Games, February 1663. A similar sort of 'back-and-forth' testimony is suggested in Richard Bagot's Answer; E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): Richard Bagot, January 1663.

[121] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): Thomas Porter, January 1663.

[122] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Sir Thomas Lyddell, May 1663. The Lyddell (or Liddell) family were granted free warren to the Bishop of Durham's demesne lands of Ravensworth and Lamesley in 1627. Sir Thomas Liddell senior was imprisoned in London and forced to compound £4000 as a delinquent as an example to other northern gentry with interests in coal-mining. He died before his father, another Thomas, so that the baronet and lands passed to his son, the second Sir Thomas Liddell. This Sir Thomas, whose Answer is in E113/10/1, married the daughter of the Sir Henry Vane, member of the Commonwealth's Council of State. Robert Surtees, *The history and antiquities of the county Palatine of Durham: Volume II* (London: J. Nichols, 1820), 209, 213.

other and former losses in the late distempered times.'[123] In Worcester Anthony Carles recalled buying some fee farms 'in the late unhappy times,' while in London William Buckeridge remembered holding ecclesiastical property 'in the time of the unhappie warre.'[124] On a certain date which he could no longer remember exactly, 'in the time of the late troubles,' Thomas Allen was nominated for a position on a subcommittee for sequestrations in Somerset.[125] The recent decades were labelled as the time of 'unhappy differences' and 'of hostility' by John Crooke and Nicholas Anderson, and alternatively as the 'tyme of the late usurped powers' by William Hawkins and Richard Lloyd, all of Yorkshire.[126] Clearly there was no dispute between plaintiff Crown and defendant subjects over the quality of the era which closed in 1660 with 'his Majesties most happy return to these his kingdoms.'[127]

The defendants' Answers therefore demonstrate a variety of patterns relating to the chronological precision of the account, the use of the secular or religious calendar, the order of the events narrated, and the quality of those times. For this reason the large number of Answers which conclude their relation at the same moment in time, around June of 1660, is all the more striking. Two purchasers of fee farm rents belonging to Queen Henrietta Maria in Worcestershire reckoned that they had enjoyed those revenues 'untill his Maj[esty's] happy restauration and not afterwards.'[128] A former commissioner both for rating the assessment and for the Militia in Oxfordshire, William Draper recalled that he had acted in those capacities since 1646 'to the tyme of His now Majesty's most happy and longed for Restauration.'[129] William Cowell remembered that he stopped selling loads of underwood from the forest within Theobalds Park 'before the twenty-fourth day of June [1660].'[130] Most defendants had little trouble remembering when they had stopped serving the Commonwealth or Protectorate. It is possible that this was because the 'end' of their service had happened very recently, and was linked to the return of the king. Another decisive event in the nation's recent political history which featured prominently as the conclusion in a large selection of stories was the execution of King Charles I in 1649 [1648 according to the 'old style' of dating the new year]. Five sequestrators from Yorkshire, including John Firth and Richard Hawkesworth, who admitted that they had served starting in 1644, claimed that they were engaged in that work 'until about the moneth of January which was in the yeare [1648] But not afterwards.'[131] A marshall for Parliament's committee in Devon in the later 1640s, Robert Sprague insisted 'to the best of his remembrance' that 'after the decease of his said late Majestie' in 1649 he never again acted at the behest of powers then ruling.[132] Other men made sure to emphasize that their tenure expired well before the regicide. The seizures and sales of books, household goods and chattels belonging to reputed delinquents which Stephen Horton undertook in Cambridgeshire all occurred 'from or about the 25th of March [1643] and not before until the 25th of March [1646].'[133]

---

[123] *S.R.* v. 224; E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): William Hussey, November 1662.
[124] E113/15/2 (Worcestershire): Anthony Carles, December 1662; E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): William Buckridge, February 1663.
[125] E113/13/1 (Somerset): Thomas Allen et al., January 1663.
[126] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): John Crooke and Nicholas Anderson, October 1662; William Hawkins and Richard Lloyd, 1662.
[127] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): William Buckridge, February 1663. Numerous other Answers use the rhetoric of relief and joy to describe the time of the Charles II's return, such as William Hussey's reference to 'his now Maj[esty's] late safe and happy return into England;' E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): November 1662.
[128] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): William Sankey and Gervase Blackwell, January 1663.

---

[129] E113/12 (Oxfordshire): William Draper, April 1663.

[130] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): William Cowell, November 1662; *S.R.* v. 226.

[131] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): John Firth and Richard Hawkesworth, January 1663. The separate Answers of George Cooper, Henry Pickering, and John Rogers likewise declare that their final collections occurred before the month of January 1648/1649.

[132] E113/6 (Devonshire): Robert Sprague, October 1662.

[133] E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Stephen Horton, April 1663.

Although it is possible that the care which these defendants took in their testimony to coordinate the length of their services with key points in the nation's political history was an example of the increasing conjunction of personal and historical memory during this period, [134] it is more probable that these men were attempting to shape a useful account of their civil war past. [135] It is very probable that all the above cited defendants knew that clause xiv of the statute provided that persons who received public monies between 1 January 1642 and 30 January 1648/49 could be considered discharged upon oath: the latter date was crucial because it was the day of King Charles I's execution.[136] Naturally, defendants' accounts would fall within particular chronological limits in order to demonstrate that they were not in fact exempt from the provisions of the Act of Indemnity. Defendants who had gathered revenues—taxes, rents, proceeds from sequestered estates—during the troubles were clearly motivated by self-interest to fit the story of their collections, paying in, and accountings within the chronological limits set by this clause. The same clause also declared that an oath would suffice for an accounting of monies collected between 1642 and 1648 if an accountant's books, notes, or receipts had been lost due to military action. Unsurprisingly, a number of Answers contain accounts of soldiers plundering and destroying important financial documents. For example, during the second civil war Nicholas Sanderson worked collecting money from three county treasurers to bring to Major-General Lambert's army besieging Pontefract castle, but how much he had received he no longer knew since all his receipt books 'were in the sayd year [1648] plundered and taken from him by other souldiers.'[137] Such Answers as these strongly suggest that the defendant's testimony might be a reinterpretation of his past to fit the statute's requirements for indemnity. Furthermore, they indicate that some men were using the provisions of the Act to give themselves a history in which they were not liable.

---

[134] The process by which people recalled their experience within a chronology largely determined by printed historical works is discussed by Daniel Woolf in *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 294-98.
[135] James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 129.
[136] 12 Car II. c. 11, clause xiv, *SR*, v, 229.

Answers which conveyed accounts that meshed with legally defined temporal boundaries were remarkably similar, both in their occasion and their contents, to the suits for redress of grievances brought by Huguenots to the *Chambre de l'edit* earlier in the century.[138] Diane Margolf has shown how the testimonies in the suits followed a script provided by the Edict of Nantes, issued by Henry IV in 1598, which aimed to restrict the 'legal memory' of that country's recent religious wars. Legal memory in this case did not mean simply establishing a date prior to which plaintiffs and defendants were not required to answer for their actions or possessions.[139] Rather, the Edict set the parameters through which particular wrongs from the recent past would be remembered in public for the purposes of redress. In the *chambre* suits what mattered was not the truth of the plaintiff's recollection of suffering and damages so much as whose testimony, the plaintiff's or the defendant's, best served the immediate political aims of the government—peace and order—articulated in the Edict.[140] In England, by contrast, the crown's political agenda could be perceived to be slightly at cross purposes: on the one hand general reconciliation through indemnity and oblivion, and on the other hand particular retribution and recompense through remembering and reckoning accounts. Certainly, the recent troubled past was not to be utterly liquidated after 1660. By mirroring the rhetoric of the Act in the Answers, thereby framing their accounts of service during the troubles purposely to fit the statute's general exemptions, it appears that a number of defendants took advantage of the selective oblivion at the heart of the Restoration process to recall for themselves, and for the public record, a particularly pardonable past.[141]

---

[137] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Nicholas Sanderson, January 1663.

[138] Diane C. Margolf, 'Adjudicating Memory: Law and Religious Difference in early seventeenth-century France' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 26 (1996), 399-418; c.f. Davis, *Fiction*, 57-60.

[139] As a consequence of Edward I's *quo warranto* proceedings in the later thirteenth century, the date of Richard I's coronation, 3 September 1189, was established as the earliest date from which disputants were required to produce documents proving title to land. According to M. T. Clanchy, this marked the formal beginning of 'artificial memory' in litigation; *From Memory to Written Record, England 1066-1307* Second Edition, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), 41-2, 152. Nor did it involve a conscious effort to turn oral memories of France's troubles into written records, as described in Woolf, *Social Circulation*, 270-80; Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture*, 271-81; Andy Wood, *The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country, 1520-1770*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 138, 150-58.

[140] Some suits were dismissed because of their potential to stir up old antagonisms; Margolf, 'Adjudicating Memory,' 415.

While the crown sought to demonstrate that the defendants were still liable for certain past activities or monies, certain rhetorical devices in an Answer could show that they were in fact already indemnified. For example, a number of defendants downplayed their agency during the wars and Interregnum through a rhetoric of authorization. The implication in these Answers was that all a defendant's former actions had been warranted and undertaken by an authority, one that was admittedly, in light of the present political situation, illegitimate. For example, William Pardoe fetched 'such moneys as certain persons then under sequestration' failed to bring in 'by virtue of' the Worcestershire Commissions' power. [142] The monthly assessment for Brecknockshire was collected and paid in, with salaries and fees deducted, by Bartholomew Games from January 1652 until January 1660 'according to the orders, warrants and Instructions of the then powers or pretended powers.'[143] The excise of beer and ale in Yorkshire was farmed to William Hawkins, Richard Lloyd, and three others 'by indenture of licence' under Protector Oliver's great seal; the five men collected large sums of money in that work 'according to the pretended laws then in force.'[144] In 1643 three West Riding men were appointed sequestrators 'by virtue of some ordinance…from Fernando Lord Fairfax;' while down in Cambridgeshire Joseph Cole took up the same employment 'in obedience to' an order of the then two Houses of Parliament.[145] It was by 'a pretended order' from Parliament's Committee for Hampshire that Richard Moore was 'nominated constituted and appointed' their treasurer; he subsequently executed that office 'in pursuance of the said pretended order.'[146] Some 'pretended authorities' were the warrant for Barnard Pinny's service as a Commissioner for sequestration in Devon from 1646 until 1648.[147]

---

[141] This partly lines up with Paulina Kewes argument that one of the aims of the Act of Indemnity was to help subjects separate good memories from bad, 'Acts of Remembrance,' 119.

[142] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): William Pardoe, January 1663. A person of this name appears in the Worcester county committee records twice (26 May 1650 and 13 August 1652); it is not known whether he was the General Baptist minister excommunicated and imprisoned from 1664 to 1671, Michel Davies, 'Pardoe, William (1630-31-1692)' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/21260, accessed 15 Jan 2007].

While recognizing that such references to warrants and orders from the higher powers were partly conventional, the rhetoric of authorization in Answers is significant for at least two reasons. First, the use of the term 'pretended' implied that defendants presently recognized, at least in their testimony, the crown's sovereignty throughout the recent past. The work of defendants had been authorized by men claiming power which was truly or, at least in light of the fact of the Restoration in 1660, illegitimate. Now in 1662 (and after) was not the time to recall any sort of 'de facto' recognition of the powers then in being, but rather to accept and to remember that no authority operating outside the crown was legitimate.[148] Second, this rhetoric was a way to turn the responsibility, and liability, away from the defendant and towards the now defunct illegitimate powers. One consequence of this language was effectively to blame a defendant's actions on 'higher powers,' thus portraying them as passive and innocent victims of the kingdom's troubles. They had simply followed orders and obeyed the then laws so as to retain peace, order and governance; in a word, it was a form of mnemonic scapegoating.[149] One Yorkshire collector and constable, Samuel Bolton, rather boldly asserted his lack of agency, claiming that 'he was forced to be imployed' by the Commonwealth regime.[150] The 'just following orders' excuse was implied by Robert Baker, a sub-collector of the excise during the 1650s 'by Authoritie derived from Oliver Cromwell;' in those times he 'did apply himself to the best of his understanding to the due exertion' of his office.[151] In addition to recalling his impeccable credit within Oxfordshire, ex-treasurer William Draper remembered that while employed by the late powers he always acted 'as inoffensively towards his neighbours in those parts and with as much moderation and candor' as was possible at that time.[152]

---

[143] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): Bartholomew Games, February 1663.
[144] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): William Hawkins and Richard Lloyd, 1662.
[145] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): A. Garforth, Wm. Garforth, and M. Wooller, May 1663; E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): Joseph Cole, April 1663.
[146] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Richard Moore, April 1663.
[147] E113/6 (Devonshire): Barnard Pinny, November 1662.

---

[148] This was asserted, albeit ambiguously, by 12 Car. II c. 12, the Act for the Confirmation of Judicial Proceedings, *S.R.* v. 234-36, and unequivocally in 13 Car. II stat. i, c.1, the *Act for the safety and preservation of His Majesty's person* (the 'Treason Act'); *S.R.* v. 304-6. On political 'de-factoism' in the Interregnum period see Quentin Skinner's classic analysis 'Conquest and Consent : Thomas Hobbes and the engagement controversy' in G. E. Alymer (ed.) *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London: Macmillan, 1972), 79-98; but c.f. Johann P. Sommerville, 'Hobbes, *Behemoth*, Church-State Relations and Political Obligation' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 205-222.

[149] The literature on this phenomenon in history is vast, complicated and marked by intense debate. My own thinking has been shaped by the reflections of René Girard; see, for example, his *Violence and the Sacred*, Translated by Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), and *The Scapegoat*, Translated by Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989). The importance of scapegoating in the lead up to the execution of Charles I is suggested by some of the declarations of the Army in 1648 examined by Patricia Crawford in '"Charles Stuart, that Man of Blood"' *Journal of British Studies*, 16 (1977), 41-61, the charges brought against king at his trial, and also in the prosecutions of a number of the men involved in the late king's death, as analyzed by Nenner in 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660.'

[150] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Samuel Bolton, January 1663.

[151] E113/5/1 (Huntingdonshire): Jasper Robbins, Robert Baker, Robert Winter jr., February 1664.

[152] E113/12 (Oxfordshire): William Draper, April 1663.

While the defendants were made to account for the money they had collected but not for the reasons they had undertaken that work or their past political allegiances, the language of their Answers suggests that they wished to dissociate completely their present persons from their former roles. The defendant's Answer rhetorically emphasised the fundamental distinction between his present person and the past performance of a particular office.[153] One might say that in such a remembrance the defendant portrayed himself as possessed of two bodies, a body personal and a body official.[154] In other words, it was the latter corpus in these post-Restoration narratives which had acted with the authority of the pretended higher powers, while the body personal, the same one which was remembering and speaking the Answer, was almost entirely absent from the account. Furthermore, the near ubiquitous usage of the passive voice in defendant's Answers when testifying about the authorizations by which they acted suggests they wished to remember their work collecting taxes, often for the present King's old foes, as something that happened to them, not something they did themselves.

Another way in which a number of defendants protrayed their active participation in illegitimate regimes, and their present liability was through expressions of regret. In 1652 Anthony Goodwin 'was nominated' a collector of the assessment for Stafford wapentake, which he accepted 'very unwillingly.'[155] After being 'commanded and injoyed' to collect the assessment for the West Riding in the summer of 1655, William Horne did '(though very unwillingly)' take in and turn over just over £359 to the receiver general.[156] William Hussey recalled that 'it was [his] unhappiness' during the distempered times 'to be drawn in' to the purchase of lands formerly owned by the dean and chapter of Salisbury cathedral.[157] One caterer from Southwark, Phillip Starkey, recalled buying and selling venison from royal deer, but noted that such activity was 'a General libertie taken in those times.'[158] Three ex-sequestrators from Huntingdonshire remembered withholding £300 each after four years' service since 'during the time of their troublesome employment' they had not received any salary.[159] Portraying themselves as troubled by the memory of their former service, these defendants implied that they, like so many others, including Lord General Sir Thomas Fairfax, had been carried down the stream of events 'by the Violence of it, rather than by my own Consent.'[160]

---

[153] Michael Braddick argues that early modern office holders, and their communities, recognized magistracy as a social role which was distinct from their person (or actions within the role of 'neighbour' or 'father'); see *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 75-81; and also his 'Administrative Performance,' '…in defending themselves from criticism, individuals claimed to have been carrying out their offices, not acting on the basis of an individual will,' 185.

[154] This distinction between the defendant's 'two bodies,' one personal and the other official, is clearly indebted to the classic study of this doctrine as related to medieval (and applicable to early modern) kingship by E. H. Kantorowitz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[155] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Anthony Goodwin, January 1662.

A few defendants attempted to put the best light possible upon their fall into regrettable service. For John Games, it was the fact that he was a younger brother, and had suffered greatly 'by reason of a tedious and harsh Imprisonment' in the late king's service during the wars, which had led Games subsequently to work for the Interregnum authorities.[161] Nor were, some defendants claimed, past actions necessarily a true measure of their real intentions. Although he and a partner possessed the rents from a sequestered estate near Aylesbury from 1651 until 1660, William Bover insisted that during this whole time 'he never had nor hath any Intention to defeate or defraud' the crown.[162] Alternatively, a defendant's later good deeds might trump his earlier lamentable service. Francis Smales, for instance, was a clerk for a sequestration committee in Yorkshire for just under a year, his service terminating in March 1645 'by reason of his disaffection to the Parliament.'[163]

---

[156] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): William Horne, January 1662.
[157] E113/15/2 (Wiltshire): William Hussey, November 1662.
[158] E113/6 (Devonshire): Phillip Starkey, January 1663.
[159] E113/5/1 (Huntingdonshire): John Pelton, John Offley and Robert Ingram, October 1663.
[160] Thomas Fairfax, *Short Memorials of Thomas Lord Fairfax* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1699), 119.
[161] E113/1 (Brecknockshire): John Games, February 1663.

A few defendants used language which consigned their civil war or Interregnum office or actions to the very remote past and hence with no connection to their present person. Whatever sums William Barnes took in by virtue of his Parliamentary commission he had 'long since paid out of his hands;' likewise, James Thompson of Cambridgeshire insisted that the goods and money he had supposedly collected were 'long since payd in.'[164] All the tithes and profits of the rectory at Kidderminster which Abraham Plimley and John Bill collected on behalf of Richard Baxter were 'long since duely answered and payd' to the minister; while the total sums related to sequestrations in the east division of Surrey which Cornelius Cooke received were 'long since accompted with the Subcommittee of Accompts.'[165] Thomas Fowke insisted that of the £100 he took in as subcollector in Islington parish there was not 'one penny thereof remaining in his hands;' similarly, Howell John [sic] declared that what money he took in as subcollector 'he paid and fully satisfied the then persons that power to receive the same.'[166] This language, emphasising the extreme temporal distance between past and present, helped defendants to downplay their personal liability, and to negate the crown's efforts to place responsibility for the actions of their past body official on their present body personal.

---

[162] E113/5/2 (Buckinghamshire): William Bover and Richard Olliffee, May 1663.
[163] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): Francis Smales, April 1663.
[164] E113/6 (Devonshire): William Barnes, November 1662; E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): James Thompson, 1662.
[165] E113/15/1 (Worcestershire): Abraham Plimley and John Hill, January 1663; E113/13/2 (Surrey): Cornelius Cooke, May 1663.
[166] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Thomas Fowke, October 1662; E113/1 (Brecknockshire): Howell John, February 1663.

Within defendants' Answers language which emphasised their distance from their former office, their regret at having taken up such employment, and its having been duly authorized during those times, together conveyed a story about their pre-Restoration work. Within these accounts their past official bodies had been simple nodes along a line of command and control, through which, during the recent unhappy times, a higher power's authority flowed down, and to which they delivered up all the money it required. While this may indeed have been an accurate reflection of the reality of their work during the wars and Interregnum, the significant feature of this language in defendants' Answers for their present standing before the crown was its implication that their former office had left no permanent mark on their body personal.[167] Defendants should not, therefore, be held liable for accounts or actions which had left no trace in the present, and belonged to the now pardoned and indemnified past.

The rhetoric of many Answers suggested that defendants understood the Act of Indemnity to be the key for articulating the significance of what they had done before the Restoration as servants of the state. As far as John Burnett and George Smithson believed, all the rents and profits they collected from Crown lands before 1660 were covered and not exempted under the Act; likewise were the taxes James Edwards recalled having gathered in Cambridgeshire between 1642 and 1649.[168] The buying and selling of the late king's paintings which Henry Carter remembered having done in order to pay arrears due to Charles I's servants was not exempted from what he called 'the Act of General Pardon.'[169] The industrious lawyer and future memorialist Bulstrode Whitelocke confessed that since 1642 he had received salaries for his various public employments, the whole of which, 'as he [was] informed' were pardoned by the Act of Indemnity, leading him to crave its benefits.[170] During all the time of the 'late troubles in England' William Draper had not 'acted done perpetrated or committed' any deed, according 'to his knowledge and remembrance,' that was not fully and freely pardoned' by the Act of Indemnity.[171] In other words, that which Draper, Whitelocke, and many other defendants testified as having happened was congruent with the pardoned and indemnified activities set out by the statute. Therefore, the language of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion allowed certain subjects, some perhaps with reason to be nervous about their recent history, to remember for themselves and the public an indemnified and pardonable past.[172]

---

[167] The same could not be said of the so-called new Cavaliers, who owed their present royal preferments to actions undertaken while still holding offices in or working for illegitimate regimes, such as former Cromwellians George Monck (Duke of Albermarle) and Edward Mountague (Earl of Sandwich).
[168] E113/7/1 (Yorkshire): John Burnett, January 1663; George Smithson, January 1663; E113/5/3 (Cambridgeshire): James Edwards, February 1663.

A nation's legal prescriptions are set and given meaning within wider public narratives which tell the community what is normative and just. Certain important laws themselves convey stories about what is, or what ought to be, true and right in a given polity.[173] The political and historical cultures of Restoration England were born in part of a statute which commanded both forgetting and remembering.[174] The selective oblivion which was the basis for the Restoration settlement, at least until 1662, was evinced by what may be understood as two competing stories conveyed within the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. The first related what might be called a narrative of general grace, in which the restored king promised to forgive and forget his repentant nation's political sins. The second, however, was a narrative of selective retribution, which reminded the public that specific men and officials had committed deeds, such as killing the royal martyr, or withholding the king's rightful revenues, which would not be pardoned or forgotten. By testifying to having done only that which had been pardoned or indemnified in law, many defendants used their Answers to place their past within the ambit of the Act's first narrative. In effect, they reinterpreted their history so that it contained deeds or amounts that were already pardoned and indemnified. Furthermore, the statute effectively became for many defendants the lens through which their past became utterly dissociated from the present.[175] Through their testimonies and their Answers the defaulting accountants fashioned themselves, now and for the future, as men whose past official actions, such as collecting three months' assessment tax for Protector Oliver, could in no way be identified with their present persons; in their public recollections they were now, and would be, subjects without liability towards the crown.[176] Therefore, a Restoration remembrance was a memory the troubled times made possible by the Act of Oblivion's commanded forgetting and forgiving.[177]

---

[169] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Henry Carter, November 1662.

[170] E113/10/1 (London and Middlesex): Bulstrode Whitelock, November 1662. For Whitelock's career see Ruth Spalding's *TheImprobablePuritan: A Life of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975).

[171] E113/12 (Oxfordshire): William Draper, April 1663.

[172] Kewes, 'Acts of Oblivion, Acts of Remembrance,' 118-23; c.f. Margolf, 'Adjudicating Memory,' 399.

[173] Robert M. Cover, 'Foreword: *Nomos* and Narrative' *Harvard Law Review* (1983), 4-10.

[174] For an argument that the Restoration process involved blotting out the civil wars to emphasise the 'new beginning,' and evoking them to legitimate the monarchy, see Jonathan Sawday, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol and Text in the Restoration,' in *The Seventeenth Century* 7 (1992), 171-99.

The recollections in the defaulting accountants' Answers were necessarily brief and specific, placing the history of one or a few men within the wider narrative of tumultuous national affairs. The bigger story of England's troubles was the concern of the authors whose writings are the subject of the next chapter. It will be evident that these longer acts of remembering were also constrained by the political realities of the 1660s and, like many defendants, that Restoration historians reinterpreted the civil wars in light of the needs of the present. What the public needed most in the decade after the collapse of the Good Old Cause, these works suggested, was to be reminded of the looming danger of another conflagration.

---

[175] A brief discussion of this process as it occurs in the experience of the individual is in P.Brockelman 'Of Memory and Things Past' *International Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (1975), 309-25; c.f. Zereubavel, *Time Maps*, 83.

[176] For a similar process in modern national historiographies see Frank R. Ankersmit, 'The Sublime Dissociation of the Past: or How to Be(come) What One is No Longer' *History and Theory* 40 (2001), 295-323.

[177] Somers, 'Narrative Constitution of Identity,' 614; Paul Ricoeur, 'Narrative Identity,' in *Philosophy Today* 35 (1991), 77.

III.

Restoration Remembrancers: accounting for the civil wars and Interregnum in historical writing, 1661-1671.

As with 'Restoration remembrances,' Restoration Remembrancers were national and personal histories written between 1660 and 1671 that both recorded recent public events and reminded readers of their meaning. Although written from different ideological standpoints, such histories interpreted the civil wars and Interregnum through explanatory narratives. The purpose of these stories was to show the applicability of general principles and rules to England's particular recent catastrophe. Historical writers from across the political spectrum therefore compassed events and figures from the recent past within moralizing tales. The effect of this kind of historical writing was to remind the public of the future's reverence for those who died for the truth, and of the ever-present danger of another violent fracturing of the nation. Civil war histories of this period therefore not only undermined the Act of Oblivion's commanded forgetting, but suggested that the troubles were indeed not truly over.

*

The goal of England's rulers in the years immediately following the king's Restoration was to remove from public view particular aspects from the late troubled times.[1] The memory of the civil wars could not, however, be buried by legislated forgetting. In 1662 Joshua Coniers, a printer of a history of the wars, pointed out that the events of recent past lingered in the present 'like a Skeleton,' provoking 'leisure thoughts' and conversations about former 'frightful deeds and honourable atchievements.'[2] Recollections of the late troubles would certainly have been stirred by reading Coniers's publication. More significantly, the account conveyed in such a written work, or aspects of it, could become part of the reader's personal memory of the civil wars.[3] In other words, historical writings might shape what their readers knew about what had happened in the recent past, and what they believed those events meant for the present.

---

[1] N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 3; Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 393.

Much scholarship on civil war histories has concerned their ideological implications. For example, both Royce MacGillivray and Mark Hartman treated the work of royalists and parliamentarians separately, and devoted sections of their analysis to particular authors such as Hobbes or Clarendon.[4] Similarly, Roger Richardson has explored the connection between early civil war historians' theory of history and their models of causation.[5] Historical writings about the wars and Interregnum have also been analysed by students of early modern historiography.[6] Justin Champion has argued that histories were as rhetorical and didactic after 1660 as before, and that their methodological innovations were not incipient signs of modernization but the fruits of ideological debates over the truth about the past.[7] David Norbrook contends that the civil wars led to a significant increase in the number of historical writers, including more women and political radicals, along with a noticeable shift from dynasty-centred stories to national ones.[8] Paulina Kewes has detected within English historiography a trend after 1660 toward heightened, even exaggerated, historical parallels and correspondences.[9] The later seventeenth century witnessed, according to Daniel Woolf, English historians' uncomfortable adjustment to permanent ideological division within the nation, along with lingering dissatisfaction over the quality of historical narratives.[10] The perception among many that English historical writing was inferior has been shown by Philip Hicks to be connected to readers' belief, well into the eighteenth century, that histories did not meet the requirements of the neo-classical genre, understood to be a continuous truthful story about significant public affairs, written by a gentleman to edify and to instruct the political elite.[11]

---

[2] Joshua Coniers, 'The Stationer to the Reader,' W. C., *History of the Commons Warre of England. Throughout These Three Nations: begun from 1640 and continued till this present Year 1662*, (London: Joshua Coniers, 1662), sig. A4.

[3] For a survey of studies concerning the ways that public events are appropriated into personal memory see Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 231-238.

[4] Royce MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974); Mark Hartman, 'Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution, 1640 to 1660' (Cambridge: Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, 1978). One of the key points in Royce MacGillvray's chronological and empirical survey of over 140 works was the recourse throughout the later seventeenth century to providential explanations by authors of all political persuasions, while Mark Hartman's doctoral thesis sought to demonstrate the extent to which the explanations of major authors such as Thomas May, Clarendon, Thomas Hobbes and James Harrington were both derivative of, and different from, the conventional interpretations set out in the king's and Parliament's official declarations of 1641-42.

[5] Roger Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution Revisited* Third Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

[6] The case for change in early modern historical writing and thought, understood as the increasing application of humanist scholarship and antiquarian methodology—in effect a tale of modernization—is made by Joseph Levine in *Humanism and History: The Origins of Modern English Historiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); for an earlier account along similar lines see F. S. Fussner's *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*, (1962).

Whether written by a former royalist or parliamentarian according to the generic protocols of the *ars historica*, for a work to be a history it was necessary to tell a story about the past.[12] To narrate the ruptured times also was to make them applicable for the nation's present and the future.[13] This chapter is therefore concerned with the role of historical writing for shaping future public narrations of the national past, that is, for putting abroad the accounts through which readers made sense of the connections between present and former national affairs.[14] Restoration Remembrancers were national and personal histories written between 1660 and 1671 that both recorded recent public events and reminded readers of their meaning. A national history aimed to tell the story of a people, a polity, or an institution, while a personal history was concerned with one or more particular lives, and could be composed in the first as well as third person.[15] The chapter will commence with an examination of eight published national histories by John Davies, James Heath, W. C., Edward Phillips, Slingsby Bethel, Peter Heylyn, Thomas Sprat, and a single—albeit famous—unpublished national history composed by Thomas Hobbes.[16] This will be followed by an analysis of twelve personal histories: six published

---

[7] J. A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: the Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 26-51; see also Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 71-95.

[8] David Norbrook, 'The English Revolution and English Historiography' in N. H. Keeble (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 236.

[9] Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 1-33.

[10] Daniel Woolf, 'Narrative Historical Writing in Restoration England: A Preliminary Survey' in W. Gerald Marshall (ed.) *The Restoration Mind* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 207-251; and 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 33-70.

[11] Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), 9-10. Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[12] Donald R. Kelley, 'The Theory of History' in Quentin Skinner and Eckhard Kessler (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 749;

Daniel Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The light of truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 9-16; On the connection between history and narrative see Jörn Rüsen, *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), 2-12, 24-5. For an argument that the breach in time caused by a modern revolution, such as France's in 1789, requires the construction of a new grand narrative and new approach to studying the past see Michel de Certeau, 'Le temps de la Révolution' in *L'Étranger, ou l'union dans la difference*, (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1991), 105-7.

[13] The terms 'rupture' and 'catastrophe' are better suited to the negative assessments of the wars than the potentially anachronistic and ethically inappropriate term 'trauma.' For example, the author of *Commons Warre* lamented that 'some malignity of the Planets' had affected the English people's genius, making 'all things disposed to a rupture,' 3-4. For other similar post-Restoration responses see also Mark Stoyle's 'Remembering the English Civil Wars' in Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004). 19-20.

[14] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Modes of political and historical time in early eighteenth-century England' in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 91-102; Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 3. On history as a form of social memory in early modern England see Daniel Woolf, in *The Social Circulation of the Past: English historical culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 269-74.

[15] This scheme is an application of Sir Francis Bacon's taxonomy of historical writing into 'Histories of Times' concerned with statecraft, and 'Lives' focused on the inner workings of human nature. Bacon's historical theory and its rhetorical application are examined in Stuart Clarke, 'Bacon's *Henry VII*: A case-study in the science of man' *History and Theory* 13 (1974), 97-118, and John F. Tinkler, 'The Rhetorical Method of Francis Bacon's *History of the Reign of King Henry VII*' *History and Theory* 26 (1987), 32-52.

[16] John Davies (attributed), *The Civil Warres of Great Britain and Ireland*, (London: R.W. for Philip Chetwind, 1661); W.C., *Commons Warre*; James Heath, *A Brief Chronicle of all the chief Action so fatally*

accounts of individual lives written by Francis Eglesfield, Richard Perrinchief, James Heath, Peter Heylyn, Thomas Gumble, and Margaret Cavendish; three published collective biographies produced in the form of a martyrology, compiled by David Lloyd, William Winstanley, and James Heath; and three unpublished personal stories, one biography and two memoirs, composed by Lucy Hutchinson, Edmund Ludlow, and Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon.[17]

By comparing and contrasting accounts of England's recent ruptured past which were written in or essentially completed during the decade after the king's return certain common aspects of their interpretations and their consequences are revealed.[18] In

---

falling out in these three Kingdoms (London: John Best, 1662); and *A Chronicle of the late Intestine War in the three Kingdoms*, Second edition (London: John Best, 1663, with a continuation up to 1675 by J.P. London: J. C. for Thomas Bassett, 1676); Edward Phillips,'The reign of King Charles' in Sir Richard Baker, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England*; Slingsby Bethel, *The world's mistake*; Peter Heylyn, *Aerius redivius: or the history of the Presbyterians...from the year 1536 to the year 1647* (Oxford: John Crosley, 1670); Thomas Sprat, *History of the Royal Society* (London: 1667); Hobbes, *Behemoth*. Sprat's book is perhaps the least like the other works in this group, yet is included for its treatment, albeit brief, of the nation's condition before the Restoration.

[17] Francis Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, (London: Roger Daniel, 1661; reprinted by C. H. Baldwyn, London: 1826); William Fullman and Richard Perrinchief (eds). *Basilika: The Works of King Charles the Martyr, with a history of his life...* (London: James Fletcher, 1662; Richard Chiswell, Second edition, 1687); James Health, *Flagellum: The life and death, birth and burial of Oliver Cromwell, the late Usurper* (London: I..R., 1663); Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death, of The most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William.. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury...*, (London: A. Seile, 1668); Thomas Gumble, *Life of General Monck, Duke of Albermarle* (London: J.S. for Thomas Bassett, 1671); Cavendish, *Life of William Cavendish*; David Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings and Deaths of Those Noble, Revered, and Excellent Personages That Suffered...In our late Intestine Wars* (London: Samuel Speed, 1668); [William Winstanley?] *The Loyal Martyrology; or Brief Catalogues and Characters of the most Eminent Persons who Suffered for their Conscience during the late times of Rebellion...*, (London: Thomas Mabb for Edward Thomas, 1665)—I am following MacGillivray *Restoration Historians*, 256, and William E. Burns, 'Winstanley, William (*d.* 1698)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/29760, accessed 15 Jan 2007] in the attribution; James Heath, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs* (London: R.H., 1665 (?)); Hutchinson, *Memoirs*; Ludlow, *Voyce*; Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon, Lord High Chancellor of England, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford. In which is included a Continuation of His History of the Grand* Rebellion Written by Himself: Vol. I. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857).

[18] A similar study that surveys some of the earliest efforts to make sense of the wars is David Cressy's 'Remembrances of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s' in *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 257-68. For the events leading up to the return of Charles II from exile in May 1660 see Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious history of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985) and Keeble, *England in the 1660s*; the first decade of Charles II's rule is also treated by Paul Seaward in *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime,*

particular, historians with opposing political values commonly used exemplary narratives, that is, accounts which pointed out the validity of applying general values and rules to the particular troubles of the recent past.[19] Thus, underpinning the narratives both of national and personal histories was the moral drawn by these historians from their materials and presented to readers as a universal and timeless truth. By means of their causal explanations and choice of scapegoats, through their selection of significant beginnings, endings and narrative turning points, and in their use of counterfactuals and moral implications, these writers shaped the public's memory of the troubled times. Before exploring these works, however, it is necessary to survey the conditions under which these histories could, or could not, reach the wider public.

The conditions of writing about the late wars, 1661-1671

Historical scholarship and access to the market of saleable printed historical works was even more profoundly shaped by political conditions and tensions after the civil wars than before.[20] The political settlement constructed in the first years after the king's return was partly shaped by a desire among the political nation to 'liquidate' the turbulent past that so haunted the present.[21] The preamble to the Act of Oblivion enjoined the king's

---

1661-1667, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), and Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 2005).

[19] Rüsen, *History*, 12.

[20] The relationship between historical erudition and early Stuart politics is examined in Woolf, *Idea of history*, and in Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), which is summarized in his *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 308-14.

[21] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 160; Harris, *Restoration*, 46-56.

subjects to 'bury all Seeds of future Discorde and remembrance of the former.'[22] The politics of reconciliation at both the local and national levels discouraged large-scale and potentially damaging enquiries into the recent past.[23] The imperative towards social peace and harmony also led the nation's political and religious leaders to implement new policies that they believed would prevent future civil disorders, including the Act of Uniformity and the Licensing Act.[24] The latter aimed to limit the amount of printed material for sale, and to ensure that what was available had been sanctioned by the authorities—in the case of historical writings one of the two Secretaries of State.[25] After the summer of 1663 the strident royalist Roger L'Estrange, who had declared that 'Persons are Pardon'd, but not Books' by the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, policed the printing trade as Surveyor of the Press.[26]

---

[22] For an analysis of the language of forgetting in the statute see Paulina Kewes, 'Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law and National Memory in Early Restoration England' in Lorna Clymer (ed.) *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 103-131.

[23] For an empirical survey of efforts among the civil leaders of Norwich after 1660 to reduce the influence of political and religious divisions on public life see John Miller, 'Containing Division in Restoration Norwich' *English Historical Review* 121 (2006), 1019-1047; Hutton, *Restoration*, 133-7; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 213; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 177; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 165. Exceptions to the official line of oblivion were made for the annual celebration of Charles I's martyrdom on the 30th of January, and to give thanks for Charles II's accession every 29 May; on the commemoration of regicide both before and after 1660 see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).

[24] That these policies had the effect of furthering political and religious divisions in England is one of Tim Harris's main arguments in his *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993); for a similar argument about the divisiveness of the Restoration's political and religious settlements consult Gary S. De Krey's *London and the Restoration, 1659-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 70-91.

[25] The Act for Uniformity of Publique Prayer (14 Car. II. c. 4, *S. R.* v., 364-70), and the Act for Preventing the Frequent Abuses in Printing Seditious, Treasonable and Unlicensed Books and Pamphlets, and for Regulating of Printing and Printing Presses (14 Car. II. c. 33, *S.R.* v., 428-33) both become law in 1662. A helpful discussion of the origin and implications of these two statutes may be found in Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 118-20, 148-54.

[26] Roger L'Estrange, *Considerations and proposals in order to the regulation of the press: together with diverse instances of treasonous, and seditious pamphlets, proving the necessity thereof.* (London: A.C., 1663), Sig. B8v. J. P. Kenyon's argument that the cumulative effects of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion and the Licensing Act was to put a 'moratorium on further discussion' of the troubles for two decades is correct insofar that writings which supported Parliament's cause or criticized Charles I did not enter the print market until after the Licensing Act lapsed in 1679; *The history men: the historical profession in*

Historical writing about the civil wars and Interregnum was thus ideologically constrained by prepublication censorship and a political climate favourable to public forgetting.[27] In practice, however, the people were often reminded of the perfidiousness of the king's execrable executioners, both during the trials of the regicides in 1660, and annually thereafter in fast sermons preached on the anniversary of Charles I's death.[28] Similarly, accusations of disloyalty based on civil war service, and of the link between dissenting Protestant religion and rebellion periodically echoed through the public arena.[29] Unsurprisingly then, writers whose historical work was favourably disposed to the royalists and the established Church of England more often received the censor's (who was Roger L'Estrange after 1662) approval, found a patron to sponsor the book's publication, and contracted with a licensed stationer for its printing.[30] Works that were or

---

England since the Renaissance (Second edition, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993), 29. Nonetheless assessments of the civil wars and their legacy loomed large in Nonconformist works during the decade; see Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 144-148, and Christopher Hill's survey of radicals re-thinking the revolution in his *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (London: Faber and Faber, 1984), 109-117 (William Seddwick), 227-42 (Samuel Pordage).

[27] On the relationship between politics and literature after 1660 see Steven N. Zwicker's 'Lines of authority: politics and literary culture in the Restoration' in Kevin M. Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); 230-70, and Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), 147-71.

[28] For a useful examination of the political and legal implications of the trials see Howard Nenner's 'The Trial of the Regicides: Retribution and Treason in 1660' in Howard Nenner (ed.) *Politics and the Political Imagination in later Stuart Britain: Essays presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, NY: Rochester UP, 1997), 21-42. The volume of extant 30 January fast sermons is vast; for an overview of their main themes see Lois Potter, 'The royal martyr in the Restoration: national grief and national sin' in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The RoyalImage: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 240-62, and Lacey's *Cult of King Charles*.

[29] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 181-87, and n. 166; on the danger of Nonconformists see the parliamentary speeches on religion and the issue of toleration from March-April 1668 in *The Diary of John Milward, member of Parliament for Derbyshire, September 1666 to May 1668*, Caroline Robbins (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 215-22, 249-50 .

[30] The clearest example of official approbation is Edward Philip's edition of Sir Richard Baker's *A Chronicle of the Kings of England* (London: Ellen Cotes for George Saubridg, 1665), which on sig. A3v bears the line 'Let this Chronicle with the Continuation be Printed' signed by Secretary Henry Bennet. Information on the printers of published works from the studied sample was gathered from Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1907); and Henry Plomer and Arundell Esdaile (eds.),

might have been deemed to be seditious because of their political and religious allegiances and implications were not printed during the 1660s, or were published anonymously.[31] Therefore, the political and legal conditions of writing and reading about the late troubles after the Restoration settlement tilted the public record and reminders of the wars noticeably towards the royalist side.[32]

Making sense through National History

The writers of national histories tended to link the causes of the civil wars with a conspiracy against the government and the Church, blamed on a small group, labelled 'the Faction.'[33] The writer of the *Commons War* blamed the conflagration of war on incendiaries 'who made every light thing grievous,' while it was clear to the world, Davies argued, that only 'some particular Factious persons' within the Parliament started

---

A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Bibliographical Society, 1922).

[31] Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, N. H. Keeble (ed.), (London: J.M. Dent, 1995). The work was completed by 1671, see David Norbrook, 'Hutchinson [née Apsley], Lucy (1620-1681),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/14285, accessed 15 Jan 2007]; Edmund Ludlow, *A voice from the Watchtower: part five: 1660-1662*, A. B. Worden, (ed.) (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978); Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, F. Tonnies (ed.), with an Introduction by Stephen Homes, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990); [Slingsby Bethel], *The world's mistake in Oliver Cromwell*, (London: [No printer listed], 1668). Another reason that the autobiographical works by Ludlow and Clarendon might not have been printed during the 1660s (or early 1670s) was the convention of not publishing such writing until after the person's death; MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 11.

[32] The tilt toward royalism within the sample of 1660s historical writing would be partly compensated were it to include works of imaginative literature produced by adherents of Nonconforming Protestant groups, which, for reasons of space, I have chosen to leave out. This body of material may be approached through the fine work of N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Non-conformity in Later Seventeenth-century England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987); Blair Worden, 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, and the Restoration' in Gerald Maclean (ed.), *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 111-56; Richard Greaves, *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity* (London: Hambleton Press, 1992), and Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[33] The 'conspiratorial' explanation had a well-established civil war pedigree, as outlined by Hartman in 'Contemporary Explanations,' 10ff, 104. His chapter on 'Royalist explanations' includes three authors whose work was published after 1660: Davies, Heylyn, and Heath.

the wars, using the ancient institution to overthrow the constitution and erect their own tyranny.[34] Phillips claimed that the conspirators behind the ruin of Charles I planned his demise for a long time, and had seized the opportunity provided by the wars to set their schemes in motion.[35] There was no doubt in Hobbes's mind that blame for inciting the Scottish revolt and English civil wars belonged to Presbyterian ministers endeavouring thereby to make themselves *iure divino* rulers of the Church, and to turn the monarchy into an oligarchy.[36] According to Peter Heylyn there were in fact two plots at work prior to the beginning of the troubles; the first was the puritan-Presbyterian plot against kings and bishops which he traced back to its origins in sixteenth-century Geneva, the second was an Independent-Republican plot which dated 'from the coming of this King [Charles I] to the Crown' back in 1625. Davies's *Chronicle* also linked the plot to Continental scheming, but believed it originated not in the mind of Calvin but with King Louis XIII's chief minister Cardinal Richelieu.[37]

The conspirators who sparked the troubles were connected to religious groups or doctrines. The Faction's religious ambitions were the reason war eventually broke out, since the 'high pretence [of] Reformation of Religion, or indeed the very preservation of it,' as preached up by London's godly ministers, sufficed to draw a portion of the multitude to Parliament's cause.[38] Heath expressed bewilderment that religion, which ought to tend men toward peace and innocence, was the ultimate cause of the recent 'miserable distractions and confusions.' It was both strange and certain that the 'guilt of so much misery' as the nation had suffered had no greater origin than differences over 'a few Ceremonies in the Church.'[39] Conflicting understandings of proper liturgy were not the only source of dissention: Phillips's *Chronicle* claimed that prior to the wars a 'great part' of the people were unhappy with the bishops, and that the Long Parliament encouraged the 'Nonconformists or puritans' to agitate for the abolition of Episcopal government.[40] Employing the traditional notion that the past is made up of figures and types whose analogues exist in the present, Heylyn argued that wherever and whenever the followers of Calvin may be found, they will be hostile to, and eventually rebel against, monarchy and episcopacy.[41] For Hobbes, however, what was significant was not the fact that the Presbyterian ministers who sparked the wars were Calvinists, but that they were clerics who claimed it was lawful to disobey and resist the king 'when he commands anything that is against Scripture,' and that they themselves should determine when it was better to obey God rather than man.[42]

---

[34] W. C. *Commons War*, 1; Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig. A1v and 378.

[35] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 625.

[36] Hobbes, *Behemoth*: 'the mischief proceeded wholly from the Presbyterian preachers, who, by a long practiced histrionic faculty, preached up rebellion powerfully,' 159; and 31, 75.

[37] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 480, 476; this book was, as Champion notes, a product of Heylyn's ideological defence of clerical independence and the power of priests, which he believed were threatened by popery and presbytery, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, 64-77. Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig A1v. Ann Hughes underscores the contemporary importance of rival conspiracy theories, 'puritan popularity' to royalists and the 'popish plot' with parliamentarians, in *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Second edition, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), 112-3 and 152-3.

---

[38] Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig. A5 and 73. Davies called the three ministers imprisoned during the 1630s for their criticisms of the king's religious policies, Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne, 'factious spirits, who are the Caterpillars of the state; yet these were the saints who in the beginning of the Long Parliament were by their power released,' 8.
[39] Heath, *Intestine War*, 2.
[40] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 612-3.
[41] The Presbyterians were a contemporary instance of the Pharisees' doctrines, revived in the Church's history in the Novatian, Arian (hence the title of the work), Donatist, and Priscillianist heresies, *Aerius*, 'Dedication.' The work was 'a perfect parallel in reference to those men, whose History I shall draw down from the time of Calvin unto these our days, tracing it from Geneva into France, from France into the Netherlands, from the Netherlands to Scotland, and from thence to England.' The perception of the relationship between present and past as exemplary-analogical also endured in Interregnum political polemics and later seventeenth-century history plays; Matthew Neufeld, 'Doing Without Precedent: applied typology and the execution of Charles I in John Milton's *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*,' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38 (2007), 329-44; Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical,' 43-54.
[42] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 50.

The nation's turmoil was also connected by a number of writers to longer-term and to universal 'natural' factors. The fact that England had enjoyed a long period of peace and prosperity was significant both to Davies and Heath: the former believed that the surfeit of riches and peace that marked the time since the Stuarts' accession had made the people so haughty that the only cure was 'a violent Bleeding,' while the latter thought it was behind the 'many disorders and irregularities' in the state at the time the Long Parliament opened in 1640.[43] The tendency of kingdoms and monarchs, as with all temporal things, to rise and then subsequently to fall could also explain, according to Heath, the precipitous descent into civil war after the heights of riches and concord during the 1630s.[44] Although the author of *Commons Warre* argued that the rupture of war originated in 'popular rage and motion,' the moving force behind these tumults was some kind of planetary malignity that affected the people's spirit.[45] Long-standing religious conflicts were also to blame. The disputes over worship and ecclesiastical government in England that eventually led to bloodshed were just the latest chapter in a century-old tale of Presbyterians stirring up kingdoms with tumults leading to 'calamitous and destructive war.'[46] For Hobbes the 'seed of rebellion' was first planted when the early medieval papacy began to assert both its spiritual independence from temporal rulers and its power to withdraw people's obedience from their king. The seditious doctrines of papal supremacy and clerical independence spread throughout Europe via the universities, which after the English Reformation were captured by Presbyterians and used to mislead the English gentry, thus becoming the 'core of the rebellion.'[47] For while at university gentlemen also learned 'the democratical principles of Aristotle and Cicero,' which are ill suited to training up a king's obedient and good subjects.[48]

---

[43] Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig. A1; Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A1v. The author of *Commons Warre* claimed that the English were 'not able to bear the weight of so great a happiness, [and] sank into a general ruin,' 1. For a more developed examination of this explanation in its broader seventeenth-century context see MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 237-42.

[44] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A1; W. C., *Commons War*, 1.

[45] W. C. *Commons Warre*, 3-4. The stationer, Coniers, elaborated on the choice of title by arguing that what happened in the 1640s and 1650s did not deserve to be called a civil war, 'for that is strictly inter pares, between equals, this was rather Bellum servile, wherein the Rout and Multitude strove for Superiority and Empire,' sig. A4. Phillips laid, albeit very gently, a portion of the blame for the wars on Charles I's political errors, notably the king's 'most unhappy…Mischoice of his Friends;' the writer imputed this to an astrological factor, the king's 'Unfortunate Ascent,' and not his lack of prudence or magnanimity, *Chronicle*, 615

[46] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 480; 434-5. Heylyn understood the civil wars in England to be the latest episode in a struggle between true Protestants and Calvinist puritans over the soul and character of the Church, which started during the period 1548 to 1572; however, it was not until the death of Archbishop Richard Bancroft in 1611 that Presbyterians 'pulled off their Disguise' and began their assault on the royal prerogative

Closely related to the necessity of assigning blame for the rupture in the nation's life was the problem of deciding when the troubles began.[49] Book thirteen of Heylyn's *Aerius Redivivus* which covered the 'rebellion in England' had two starting points: 1626 in the chapter heading and 1617 in the body of the text. It may be that Heylyn thought he had to go back further than the second year of Charles I's reign the better to establish the renewed stirrings of the Presbyterian plot during the tenure of George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury (1611-1633).[50] In Heath's 1663 *Chronicle* the narrative begins with the murmurings against Archbishop Laud's liturgical policies by Burton, Bastwick, Prynne and Lilburne; these English troubles, the writer argued, were the precursors of similar

---

through Parliament, which ultimately lead to them into rebellion. The latent Presbyterian determination to restrain royal power was finally made manifest on 4 January 1642 with the House of Commons vote that King Charles's entry in search of Five Members was a breach of Parliamentary privilege, pg. 444.

[47] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 17, 23, 58. A. P. Martinich contends that in *Behemoth* Hobbes wrongly but intentionally conflated puritans and Presbyterians (the latter only really emerging at the Westminster Assembly), and over-emphasises the connection between the ministers and the Long Parliament. The prominent ministers of 1640-42 were not, in fact, preaching revolution; A. P. Martinich, 'Presbyterians in *Behemoth*' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 121-138.

[48] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 43, 158.

[49] For an argument that contemporary post-revisionist historians of the 'Wars of the Three Kingdoms' need to push back the origin of the conflict(s) from the 1630s to 1618 see the 'Introduction' to Scott's *England's Troubles*, 3-32. Since Phillips edition of Baker's *Chronicle* picks up the story where Sir Richard ended, with the accession of Charles I in 1625, it is more difficult to gauge his sense of when things started to go wrong, *Chronicle*, 458.

[50] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 433-4.

disruptions in Scotland.[51] Hobbes thought the troubles started in 1637 with the Scottish disturbances, but opened his second Dialogue 'on the spread of rebellious opinions' at or around the opening of the Long Parliament in 1640.[52] For Heath the disturbances in Scotland over the liturgy in the later 1630s were important but not the beginning of England's upheavals, which he thought started with the Long Parliament's efforts to impeach the earl of Strafford in 1640/1.[53] The author of *Commons Warre* dated the troubles to the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in October 1641, after which time 'all things conspired to the ruin and confusion that presently followed.'[54]

Several writers identified the moment when the normal means of resolving political differences collapsed and war became inevitable. When Sir John Hotham refused to allow King Charles entry into Hull to possess its magazine in April 1642 he made visible, Davies declared, the breach between Parliament and the king, and 'first indeed [began] the Civil War.'[55] A number of works focussed on the dispute between the king and Parliament over control of the militia: Heath claimed it was the principal difference between the two and ultimately ruptured their connection; W. C. contended that it was this issue that forced people to declare their allegiance.[56] Phillips argued that 'our Troubles' began with the breach concerning the Militia as evidenced by the printed petitions and answers exchanged between the king and the Houses in early 1642. By the summer of 1642 communications between the king and Parliament on this issue simply exacerbated their differences, and England began 'to be divided (as once was Italy into Gulphes and Gibellines) into Royalists and Parliamentarians, Cavaliers and Roundheads.'[57] Similarly, Hobbes wrote that the war got under way once Charles I sent his Answer to Parliament's Nineteen Propositions. In other words, the civil war had started in print.[58]

---

[51] Heath, *Intestine War*: 'the smoke and smother in England concerning ceremonies broke out into fire in Scotland,' 3.

[52] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 28, 61.

[53] Davies *Civil Wars* starts with an overview of the 'long peace' which existed under James I and Charles I, which had unfortunately allowed the 'factious spirits' to infect the body politic like a bad humour, 2. He does allow that the Scots inspired popular tumults in London in early 1640, which were to play a large role in Strafford's conviction, 20. James Heath's 1662 *Brief Chronicle* likewise begins with an overview of the peace, its corrupting effect on the people, and then turns to the people's complaints leading to the execution of Strafford, sig. A1v.

[54] W. C., *Commons Warre*, 4.

[55] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 71, 77; cf. W. C., after a skirmish between Hotham and Sir John Meldrum near Hull 'Bellona began to swagger and domineer everywhere.'

[56] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A3; W. C. *Commons Warre*, 14: "for it was a ticklish Question all along the War; *Who are you for?*"

Most national historians argued that the kingdom's turmoil ended not with the conclusion of the civil wars but rather with the return of the king. For Heath the troubled times ceased when the 'Free Parliament' supported by General Monck appointed a day of thanksgiving for his work in liberating them from bondage and permitting them to restore the land's ancient constitution.[59] The progress of Charles II through London to Whitehall on 29 May 1660 marked, according to Phillips, the return of peace and happiness, and, by implication, the conclusion of the conflict.[60] The end of the troubles could become, at least for one writer later in the decade, the lens through which to make clear all that happened before. Although not concerned to tell the whole story of the civil wars and Interregnum, Thomas Sprat insisted that those years' 'dreadful revolutions' should be remembered for having the happy result of pointing men to the necessity of bringing back the king. Upon the return of Charles II such an 'admirable chain of events' ensued, particularly for Sprat, with the incorporation of the Royal Society, that it made up 'for the whole Twenty years of Melancholy that had gone on before.'[61] The characterization of the troubles as a period of melancholy was no doubt a deliberate effort to remind readers in 1669 that despite the plagues of 1665, the Great Fire of London in 1666, and Dutch ships sailing up the Medway in 1667, things were indeed better with the king than without him.[62] They also underscored the futility of purposeful action, such as scientific enquiry, when all the normal political and religious landmarks had been swept aside.[63]

---

[57] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 552, 558.
[58] Heylyn also claimed the war opened in the spring of 1642 with Parliament's *Nineteen Propositions* and the king's subsequent *Answer*. *Aerius*, 446.
[59] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, 442.
[60] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 778; Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 108.

The king's return could also serve as the last event of the writer's history; Davies's *Civil Wars* concluded with its author confronting the sublime—Charles II's entrance into London provoked such joyful popular acclamations that they 'are rather to be imagined than expressed.'[64] Other national historians carried their narrative at least up to Charles II's coronation in April 1661. For Phillips, the king's official assumption of his regal office was a 'Convenient Haven,' filled with promises of a calm and peaceful government, and so a most suitable terminus for a history characterized by 'Troubles and Confusions, an Unnatural and Intestine Warr succeeded by a long time of Usurpation and Misrule.'[65] Thus the troubled times were like a storm which the ship of state had managed to weather, with the coronation serving as the promise that ever after things would be tranquil. Hobbes also ended *Behemoth* on a somewhat upbeat note, because the Cavalier Parliament's Militia Act (1661), which gave the king sole control of the army, was both 'instructive to the people' about the location of sovereignty, and disarmed the rebellious.[66] Since Heylyn was concerned to show how the Presbyterians had dragged the Stuart kingdoms into 'a calamitous and destructive war' he stopped his narrative at the point in 1647 when the Independents and the army successfully rebelled against the original rebels.[67] Therefore, unlike the other national histories that ended at or just after the king's happy restoration, thus resembling a romance, Heylyn's story of Presbyterian perfidy was ultimately a tragedy.[68]

---

[61] Sprat, *Royal Society*, 58.

[62] On the decline of royal prestige by the end of the 1660s see Harris, *Restoration*, 68-80, and Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 64-76. In a wide-ranging study Angus Gowland links the increased awareness of widespread melancholy in early modern Europe to the disruptive effects of social, political, and religious upheavals dating from the mid sixteenth century, and hints in his conclusion at a similar phenomenon in Restoration England; 'The Problem of Early Modern Melancholy' *Past and Present* 191 (2006), 77-120.

[63] I own this point to J.R. Jones.

[64] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 378; cf. Heath's *Brief Chronicle*: 'the acclamations and shoutings were so loud and hearty that it is impossible to echoe or express them,' sig. E1.

[65] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 806-9. Heath's 1663 *Intestine War* and the *Commons Warre* both carry their story up to, and slightly beyond the coronation, which might reflect the convention of a chronicle to conclude *in medias res*.

The turning points and counterfactuals highlighted by a national history indicated which moments between the beginning and end of the troubles were particularly important and therefore memorable.[69] They were also a means to show the operation of the principles that gave those years meaning. For example, Heylyn and Davies believed that the civil wars could have been avoided entirely if either James I or his son had purged the body politic of bad humours by crushing the Presbyterians earlier in their respective reigns.[70] Similarly, Hobbes ventured, albeit jokingly, that the execution of some 1,000 seditious clerics before 1640, though indeed 'a great massacre,' could have prevented the deaths of 100,000 during the wars.[71] The importance of good counsel was demonstrated when Heath contended that the king's failure to heed his bishops' advice against assenting to the Bill of Attainder which convicted the earl of Strafford almost certainly led to 'those miseries that ensued presently thereafter.'[72] October 23 proved to be a 'fatal day' during the wars, since the first significant meeting between royalist and Parliamentary armies in 1642 at Edgehill occurred exactly one year after the outbreak of the Irish rebellion.[73] Most writers of national history thought that the king could have won the war, until the summer of 1643 when he chose to use his western army to besiege the city of Gloucester instead of marching with it straight to London. That decision, again blamed on bad counsel, proved 'a fatal mistake to the King,' since the city held out long enough to be relieved by the earl of Essex, putting a stop to that year's military successes.[74] The king never had a similar opportunity to win a decisive victory. This was further evident the following year when the royalists lost the north after their defeat at 'the bloodiest battle that was fought throughout the wars,' Marston Moor, at which they lost, according to Heath, 4,000 men.[75] Yet, had Charles I not relied so heavily on lawyers and former members of Parliament for his military strategy, Hobbes thought, he might have used all means available to secure total victory.[76]

---

[66] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 204; 13 Car. II stat. 1 c. 6, *S. R.* v. 308-9.
[67] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 480-82.
[68] A romance is at its most elementary level a story with a happy ending, and is, according to Evitar Zerubavel, the prototype of all narratives of historical progress; *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 15. Sprat's *Royal Society* also follows a romantic plot, beginning with the intellectual slavery during the Interregnum followed by the king's liberation and the triumph of reason, embodied in the Society, 58, 78, 372.
[69] A modern case for the importance of counterfactuals in historical writing is made by Niall Ferguson, 'Virtual History: Towards a "chaotic" theory of the past' in his collection of essays *Virtual history: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (London: Papermac, 1998), 1-90.
[70] Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig. A2; Heylyn, *Aerius*, 369, furthermore, Heylyn argued, had Charles I not trusted the Scots at Court such as the Duke of Hamilton he could have sent a fleet up the Firth of Forth in 1637 and suppressed the Covenanters for good, 435.
[71] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 95. Admittedly it does take two attempts for 'A' to convince 'B' of this policy; I owe this reminder to Jacqueline Rose.

Parliament's response to its frustrations on the field of battle in the summer of 1644, which the historians argued had significant military and political consequences, was to purge its officer corps and re-model its army through a Self-Denying ordinance.[77] The creation of the 'new Modell' army in 1645, and its defeat of the king's forces at the battle of Naseby in June, was a disaster.[78] After that 'fatal battle,' which Heath suggested might have turned out differently, the king and his party continued to lose engagements and places until eventually all was lost.[79] At the same time that Parliament was triumphant in the field, at Westminster its Presbyterian members began to struggle against Independents with 'villainous artifices' to set up a republic.[80] Davies argued that it was plain that the Independents' had designs on getting rid of the king and erecting a commonwealth already in 1645, not only from what they did in 1649, but from their unwillingness between 1645 and 1649 to accept any of Charles I's peace proposals.[81] The king's trial and execution, along with the creation of an English commonwealth in 1649, were unprecedented events in the nation's history—even under the Romans, Heath pointed out, the people had had new rulers but not a different system of rule—and served as an unforgettable (and memorably horrible) point of pause in the narrative.[82]

---

[72] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 19; cf. Davies, *Civil Wars*, Strafford's blood 'drew after it many thousand innocent lives,' 48. For earlier examples of the historian as politic counsellor see Woolf, *Idea of History*, 151-68.
[73] Davies stated that Edgehill was a royalist victory because it left the king an uninhibited way to London.*Civil Wars*, 81. Heylyn was more certain that Edgehill was a royalist rout since the king was left master of the field and in possession of the corpses, *Aerius*, 447; W. C., *Commons Warre*, 15-16.
[74] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A7; W. C., *Commons Warre*, 36; Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 128.
[75] W.C., *Commons Warre*, 49-50; Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. B1.; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 572
[76] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 115, 125; As David Wootton has pointed out, Hobbes's target with this jab was the earl of Clarendon, 'Thomas Hobbes's Machiavellian Moments' in Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (eds.), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 224.

The years subsequently known as 'the Interregnum' contained fewer memorable counterfactuals and turning points than the war years, evidenced from the amount of space national histories devoted to its narration. For example, Heath's 1663 *Chronicle* covered the events of 1653 and 1656 with two and five pages respectively, which combined were less than a quarter of the portion devoted to the affairs of 1647. As far as Hobbes was concerned, 'nothing else worth remembering' happened domestically in

---

[77] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 126.
[78] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. B4.
[79] W. C., *Commons Warre*, 65; Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 78; Davies, *Civil Wars*, 156.
[80] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 586, 598-600; Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 113, 126.
[81] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 152; cf. Heylyn's dating of the 'Independent-Republican Plot' to 1625, *Aeirus*, 480.
[82] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 221. The regicide concludes the 'first part of the history of the British civil wars' for Davies, *Civil Wars*, 282; Heath also puts it at the end of Part One of his *Intestine Wars*, 223, while for Phillips the king's death naturally brings Charles I's section of the *Chronicle* of kings to a close, 629.

1653 and 1654 apart from Cromwell's crushing of a royalist plot.[83] Over half of Davies's *Civil Wars* deals with the time from the outbreak of hostilities in 1642 to the regicide, while the Interregnum *and* Restoration get a quarter of his narrative. The fact that Davies related public affairs during the Protectorate by telling about the execution of anti-Cromwellian conspirators Gerard and Vowel in July 1654 suggested that for him, nothing mattered during those years apart from royalist resistance to the tyrant Oliver. Phillips examined the years 1650 to 1658 in forty-nine pages, yet then used one hundred and twenty-six to bring his *Chronicle* up to 1661.[84] In the case of Phillips, a strong correlation no doubt existed between his having access to General Monck's private papers and the length of his account of the Restoration.[85] However, in this case and in the other national histories the impression created by the narrative was that few things worthy of remembrance happened during the Interregnum. In these stories, the civil wars were like a range of memorable 'mountains' while, by comparison, the 1650s were foothills.[86] Furthermore, the dearth of events from the 1650s in these stories implies that the writers understood the decade to be a sort of 'wilderness of waiting' for the necessary and inevitable return of the king; on their own terms the 1650s could not be conceived as contributing anything lasting or worthwhile to English history.[87]

---

[83] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 184; for fuller treatments of the philosopher's understanding of history and time see Karl Schuhmann's 'Hobbes's concept of history' in G. A. J. Rogers and Tom Sorell (eds.) *Hobbes and History* (London: Routledge, 2000), 3-24, and Patricia Springborg's 'Hobbes and historiography: Why the future, he says, does not exist' in G. A. J. Rogers and Tom Sorell (eds.) *Hobbes and History* (London: Routledge, 2000), 44-72.

[84] These figures are the result of counting pages in each of the works.

[85] Phillips mentions having been given access to the papers of Monck's chaplain, Thomas Clarges, at *Chronicle*, sig. A4.

[86] Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 25.

[87] I owe this point to Daniel Woolf. For a modern argument which attempts a reassessment of the decade see Derek Hirst's 'Locating the 1650s in England's Seventeenth Century' *History* 81 (1996), 359-83.

Several national historians found it necessary to tell two over-lapping stories about 1649 to 1660: those years were narrated as a time of military (and for Bethel, until 1653, commercial) success for the English nation, while simultaneously they represented a period of political failure for the state.[88] For example, the new Republic's successful campaigns against the Irish (1649-51), the Scots (1650-51), and the Dutch (1652-54) were celebrated.[89] The middle years of the 1650s were remarkable according to the national historians primarily for Cromwell's seizure of sovereignty following his dissolution of the previously purged Long Parliament in April 1653, the dismal failure of his Western Design, the experiment of local government by Major-Generals, and the Lord Protector's prodigious death on 3 September 1658.[90] For Slingsby Bethel April 1653 was the hinge on which the decade turned, since it was Cromwell's dissolution of the Rump, his assumption of power and subsequent ill-conceived plan to seize Spanish territories in the West Indies that torpedoed the nation's trade and brought it low from the 'flourishing and formidable posture' it had enjoyed previously.[91] Therefore, not everything one could tell about what had happened during the Interregnum was bad, both in relation to public affairs and to individuals.

---

[88] Hobbes conveyed the breakdown of the English state by repeating 'for memory's sake' the sequence and duration of the 'many shiftings' in sovereignty during the period; *Behemoth*, 195.

[89] On the Irish campaign, Davies, *Civil Wars*, 293-9, W. C. *Commons Warre*, 94-99, Heath, *Intestine War*, 237-53, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 638-9; on affairs in Scotland, the Battle of Worcester, and King Charles II's escape, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 652-69, *Commons Warre*, 100-113, Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. C3-C8v, Davies, *Civil Wars*, 314-23; on the First Dutch War, Davies, *Civil Wars*, 320, Phillips *Chronicle*, 672-4, *Commons Warre*, 116-8, 120, Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 311-31.

[90] On Cromwell's dissolution of the Long Parliament (the 'Rump'), see Davies, *Civil Wars*, 332, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 672; for the collapse of Cromwell's 'Western Design' see Davies, *Civil Wars*, 346, Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. D4, W.C. *Commons Warre*, 127; on the rule of the Major-Generals see Davies, *Civil Wars*, 350, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 682 and Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. D4v, and *Intestine Wars*, 378; for great winds on the death of Cromwell, see Davies, *Civil Wars*, 362, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 691, and a whale beaching along the Thames as a portent of his death, Davies, *Civil Wars*, 361, W. C., *Commons Warre*, 133, and Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. D6v.

[91] Bethel, *The world's mistake*, 3, 8.

National histories also recorded and commemorated virtuous and notorious figures from the troubles. Hobbes was, however, the exception, preferring to preserve the name and doctrines of the perpetrators of 'the memorable civil war'—the Presbyterians—rather than particular persons.[92] Given the political context of writing about the troubles in the 1660s, the men remembered as 'Noble and Valiant' tended overwhelmingly to be from the 'Royal and justest side.'[93] They included men who were executed at the behest of the Long Parliament, such as the earl of Strafford (1641), Archbishop William Laud (1645), and of course, King Charles I (1649). In Davies's *Civil Wars*, Strafford behaved like a true martyr on the scaffold, forgiving his enemies and dying a true and obedient son of the Church of England. The Archbishop delivered a short homily on Hebrews 12.2 before being killed as a 'stout Champion' of the hierarchy and liturgy. Rather than narrating the proceedings of the High Court of Justice and the king's final moments, Heath choose to insert a woodcut showing the king upon the scaffold along with the text of his last speech, 'being the sum of the Life, Tryal and Death of that most incomparable Prince.'[94] Heylyn incorporated a 'Bill of Mortality' of London's ministers who had been 'imprisoned, plundered and barbarously used' for their constancy to the Protestant religion and loyalty to the king, including the sixteen dead. He went on to argue that more ministers were deprived of their livings by the Presbyterians in the space of three years than were under the entire reigns of Queens Mary and Elizabeth.[95] Other memorable individuals were slain in battle, such as the earls of Carnarvon and Sunderland, and Lord

---

[92] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, liii; although, see below on his treatment of Cromwell.

[93] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A3.

[94] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 47-8, cf. Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 19, and Phillips, *Chronicle*, 534; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 584, cf. Davies, *Civil Wars*, 144, Heylyn, *Aerius*, 469; Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A8-C2, cf. Davies, *Civil Wars*, 279-82, W. C. *Commons Warre*, 92, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 609-15.

[95] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 455-8; among these Anglican martyrs was one Dr Brough of Michael Cornhill 'sequestered, plundered, wife and children turned out of doors, and his Wife dead with grief.'

Falkland, who died at the first battle of Newbury September 1643, or collectively demonstrated particular 'loyalty and valour,' as did the earl of Newcastle's white-coated 'Lambs' at Marston Moor.[96] The most celebrated figure to emerge from the troubles was the 'ever to be remembered' General George Monck, whose coming to London in the spring of 1660 and order to re-admit the Members of Parliament excluded by the army had made the king's return a reality.[97] What the general did, Phillips declared, was so glorious that the present age and 'our Posterity' could not admire it enough. [98]

The troubles also witnessed characters whose villainy the national historians hoped the public would never forget. One of the leading figures in the early years of the Long Parliament, John Pym, was 'a great stickler' against the king's prerogative who could, according to Heath, 'wiredraw [sic] money with every word he uttered to the City.'[99] The first man openly to oppose the king on behalf of Parliament at Hull, Sir John Hotham, was executed for treason along with his son 'by that Party for whose sakes they did it;' in other words, by attempting to amend their earlier treachery they were killed.[100] The minister Stephen Marshall preached so confidently in 1642 against an oath taken by Parliamentary prisoners not to bear arms against the king 'that the pope himself could scarce have done with the like.'[101] Most notorious were the men who had the audacity to sit in judgement upon their king; Davies thought his readers would not think it improper for him to include a list of their names 'that they may stink to future generations.'

---

[96] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A7v, and *Intestine Wars*, 61; cf. W. C. *Commons Warre*, records the death of 'Sir Beril Greenvil' at the battle of Landsdown, 33.
[97] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 378. According to Heath, Monck's 'conquering Prudence did Revenge and cease Murder and Treason/He our Wall of Peace,' *Intestine Wars*, 442.
[98] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 773.
[99] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 56; According to Phillips, Pym was heard to prophesy to some of his 'Accomplices' that 'the time would come when there will be no need of Crowns and Scepters,' *Chronicle*, 570.
[100] W. C. *Commons Warre*, 11; Davies, *Civil Wars*, 77, 143.
[101] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 448.

Heath's *Chronicle* listed the regicides according to their fate—those that died before the Restoration, those who fled the country after 1660, those in prison awaiting sentence, and those who later recanted or were pardoned—while Phillips included the names of the king's judges and short descriptions of their origin, social status, or character.[102] At or near the head of these rolls of dishonour was the 'English Monster' and 'Grand Usurper of infamous Memory,' Oliver Cromwell.[103] That a squire from Huntingdonshire could have risen to become an all-conquering General and Lord Protector of three kingdoms was among the most astonishing, and memorable, developments of the period; from the conclusion of the wars until his death Cromwell's character, ambition, and deeds propel the national narrative.[104] While Davies and Phillips were willing to acknowledge the man's courage, resolution, and magnanimity, albeit employed in the 'evil Evils' of regicide and usurpation, Heath and Bethel wanted Cromwell remembered strictly as an oppressive tyrant and notorious dissimulator.[105] As far as Bethel would recall in 1668, nothing Cromwell did was ever in anyone's interest but his own.[106]

Exemplary principles in National Histories

---

[102] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 278; Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 196-202; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 616-8, 'Col. Henry Martin, notorious for his ill life… Miles Corbet, a Person of a good Family in Norfolk, had his Conditions been answerable…Thomas Scot, a Brewers Clerk, next a Country attorney, as last burgess of Wickham, a furious enemy to King and Kingly Government.'

[103] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 196; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 616.

[104] For example, Heath assigned the genesis of Cromwell's design to usurp the government to controversy between the Army and Presbyterians in Parliament during 1647-48, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. B5v, *Intestine Wars*, 186-7; Hobbes likewise claims that Cromwell's aim from 1647 was to take the king's power, *Behemoth*, 143.

[105] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 362; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 691; Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. D2v, and *Intestine War*, 60, where Health does allow that Cromwell was 'an indefatigable soldier and of great courage,' but cf. 186-87; Bethel, *The world's mistake*, 11-13. For a modern assessment of Cromwell's career and legacy which acknowledges the grudging respect his received from his enemies see John Morrill's 'Rewriting Cromwell: A Case of Deafening Silences' *Canadian Journal of History* 38 (2003), 553-78.

[106] Bethel, *The world's mistake*, 18[12].

The purpose of these national stories was to remind people that there were clear morals to be drawn from the civil wars and Interregnum.[107] In pointing out the applicability of broader truths such as the oversight of providence, the danger of popularity, the threat of religious disunity, the virtue of loyalty and the sin of rebellion, the writers of national history were helping readers to understand better the contemporary implications of England's broken times.

The doctrine of God's providence, that the Almighty oversees the unfolding of events ultimately to bring them to a good end, was widely believed in English culture before and during the civil wars and Interregnum.[108] Not surprisingly then, providence was regularly invoked after 1660 by most writers of national histories, Hobbes's *Behemoth* being the notable exception. The philosopher saw the years 1640 to 1660, 'the highest time,' as what could be termed a mnemonic mountain range of human conceit, folly, and hypocrisy.[109] For the other national historians, from beginning to end, the troubles testified to God's handiwork, although they distinguished the Lord's approbation from his permission. For example, Heath declared that God had tipped the scales at the battle of Naseby by choosing not to give assistance to the king's forces. This had occurred, he believed, not because God was a Parliamentarian, but so that divine power and not force of arms would thereafter be the royalists' strength, and so that posterity would always remember the 'visible and glorious manifestations of *Digitus Dei*.'[110] The Lord's justice, Phillips explained, could not let the sins of the English go unpunished, so the earl of Bristol's speech to the Lords warning about the dangers of civil war and need for a 'timely Accommodation' in early 1642 'though well received, yet proved ineffectual.' Most mysteriously, the Lord had permitted Charles I to be tried and executed by his own subjects.[111] Several events, however, were taken as signs of the Lord's support for the royal cause. Charles II's wonderful deliverance after the battle of Worcester was 'a providence indeed not paralleled in History;' almost as memorable was the help the king received from women and the lowly during his escape.[112] The events of 1660 which combined to produce the king's 'restitution' were a 'chain and series' of providences against the former usurpations, evident in the fact that God plucked the people's deliverer, General Monck, from the same 'place which started the miseries—Scotland.'[113]

---

[107] Echoing seventeenth-century historians, John Morrill recently argued that Cromwell 'still has things to teach us' in 1999; see his '"A Great and Deserved Name:" Commemorating Cromwell' *History Review* 34 (1999), 22-5.

[108] A key text for providential thinking was Thomas Beard's *The theatre of Gods iudgements: or a collection of histories out of sacred, ecclesiasticall, and prophane authors; concerning the admirable iudgements of God vpon the transgressours of his commandements* (London: Adam Islip, 1597). For a study of the role of providential thinking in the formation of Protestant consciousness in England from 1560 to 1640 see Alexandra Walsham's *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); for the civil wars and after see Blair Worden, 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England' *Past and Present* 109 (1985), 55-99; MacGillivray also surveys various historians' deployment of 'divine intervention in the civil wars' in *Restoration Historians*, 24, 142, 162, 200, 220-22, 235, and 239-41.

[109] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 1.

Among the political lessons to be drawn from the origins of the civil wars was the danger of popular intrusions into public affairs.[114] According to Davies, factious politicians used the controversy over Ship money, an important and controversial non-parliamentary source of royal revenue during the 1630s, to draw down popular odium on the king by claiming that it was 'a breach of civil rights and tyrannical to raise money' without Parliament's consent.[115] Phillips was especially keen to show the negative consequences of politics out of doors; he noted that from almost the very beginning of the Long Parliament the people, often large crowds of them, brought their petitions 'thick and threefold,' such as one signed by eight hundred 'Presbyterians' against the bishops.[116] Popular demonstrations in London in May 1641 had terrified many in the Houses, and the king himself, into agreeing to convict and execute the earl of Strafford: Phillips claimed that Charles I's consent to Strafford's execution 'was in a manner Extorted' by the 5,000 citizens of the city 'most armed with Swords, Cudgels and Staves,' who had thronged to Westminster 'crying out for Justice.'[117] Heath blamed 'popular importunities,' and Phillips the 'tumultuous concourse of the London Apprentices' for forcing the king to assent to the exclusion of the bishops from the House of Lords.[118] The king's removal from Westminster to Hampton court in early 1642 was due to the increasing 'numbers of ordinary people gathered together in a tumultuous manner about White-Hall.'[119] These accounts demonstrably proved the danger of the 'many-headed Hydra,' the common people, having too much knowledge about, and freedom to participate in, political affairs.[120] For the author, and for the printer, of

---

[110] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 78; cf. Phillips, *Chronicle*, 558: Naseby was 'as Heaven would have it' a complete victory for the Parliamentarians.

[111] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 555. Precisely what these sins were the writer does not say Phillips, *Chronicle*, 609; W. C. *Commons Warre*, 132.

[112] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 301. Weber argues that providential interpretations of Charles II's escape helped to elevate the authority of the formerly 'despised exile' who had been forced to invade his country in 1651, *Paper Bullets*, 28-30. The silence of the Pendrill brothers' wives concerning the whereabouts of Charles II, given that women usually 'are so ill keepers of secrets' could only be attributed to providence; Davies, *Civil Wars*, 323; Phillips thought it remarkable the level of assistance Charles II received during his flight from 'the Indigent and people of mean condition, whom either hope of Gain might have tempted, or denouncement of Penalty terrified to a betraying of him,' *Chronicle*, 669.

[113] Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 444; Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig. A3.

[114] The origin of the public sphere in Britain is the subject of much debate; for an overview and re-assessment of the issues see Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), 273-92.

---

[115] Davies, *Civil Wars*, 6-7.

[116] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 516; Heylen, *Aerius*, 428. David Zaret makes a strong case for the importance of petitions and petitioning during the 1640s in expanding the scope of English political culture in his *Origins of democratic culture: printing, petitions, and the public sphere in early-modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); see also Derek Hirst's 'Making Contact: Petitions and the English Republic' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), 26-50, for the 1650s.

[117] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 532.

[118] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. 6-7; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 547.

[119] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 549.

[120] The awareness of this danger was arguably the motivation for the Cavalier Parliament's Act against Tumults and Disorders upon Pretence of Preparing or Presenting Public Petitions, (13 Car. II. stat. 1 c. 5, S. R. v., 308); Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 92. On the later seventeenth-century political legacy of popular politics in the early years of the Long Parliament see Tim Harris, 'Understanding popular politics in

Commons Warre this lesson meant that the whole period deserved to be remembered as the time when 'the Rout and Multitude strove for Superiority and Empire.'[121]

The civil wars and Interregnum also provided ample evidence of the dangers that pernicious doctrine and the abuse of religious language posed to political and social order.[122] The Scots had revolted against Charles I in 1637-8 and invaded England in 1640 and 1644 for sake of a 'reformation of religion;' the same 'high pretence' was deployed by London preachers to 'persuade the people religiously out of their money' to pay for Parliament's war against the king, and during the Interregnum, according to Sprat, sects had reduced religious language to 'fantastical terms' and 'outlandish phrases.'[123] Heath was certain that the blame for the kingdom's miseries lay with the men behind 'the Cavils, Discontents, and disputes' about the Church of England's liturgy; in *Behemoth* the scapegoats are clearly Presbyterian clerics who desired power for themselves and preached up rebellion instead of obedience.[124] Heylyn was filled 'with Religious horror' when relating the 'prodigious and unheard Irreverences' visited upon Exeter cathedral by Parliamentary soldiers who had been stirred up by seditious preachers.[125] Both

---

Restoration Britain' in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus (eds.) *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 128-39, 151-2.

[121] Coniers, 'To the Reader' *Commons Warre*.

[122] Hobbes, *Behemoth*: the Presbyterians were, says 'B,' 'the most impious hypocrites [as] manifest enough by the war their proceedings ended in,' 26.

[123] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 573; Davies, *Civil Wars*, 73; Sprat, *Royal Society*, 42. cf. near the end of the second dialogue which describes the situation in England in August 1640, 'A' recapitulates the main points of the story so far: 'how Parliament destroyed the peace of the kingdom; and how easily, by the help of seditious Presbyterian ministers, and of ambitious ignorant orators, they reduced this govt into anarchy,' Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 109.

[124] Several writers recounted instances of puritan attacks on the fabric of the national Church: in the summer of 1641 the Long Parliament employed Sir Robert Harlow to remove 'scandalous Pictures, Crosses and Figures within Churches' as part of its 'Worthy Reformation;' see Heath, *Intestine Wars*, 2, Phillips, *Chronicle*, 535, Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 159, 167; Hobbes was less concerned, Borot argues, with the truth of religious teachings, and more with their political consequences, particularly in encouraging obedience or revolt; 'Hobbes's *Behemoth*,' 145.

[125] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 450-52; W. C. thought that since the pulling down of the cross at Cheapside by the 'mad zeal of the folks of London' in 1643 was accompanied by martial music, 'it is fit to be recorded for an unlucky piece of the War,' *Commons Warre*, 32.

Presbyterians and papists, Heylyn argued, aimed in their own particular ways to destroy the Protestant Church established by law, an aim the Presbyterians had graphically demonstrated during the civil wars with their 'Blessed Reformation.'[126] The puritan-Presbyterian rebellions made perfect sense, Heylyn claimed, if one remembered that Calvin's *Institutes* and Beza's *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* prostituted the 'dignity of the Supreme Magistrate to the lusts of the people,' and exalted the power of 'popular Magistrates.'[127] Related to danger of uncontrolled religious ministers who promoted dangerous doctrines was the necessity to deny such men a public platform, as in Hobbes's famously harsh, if slightly hyperbolic, counterfactual about killing Presbyterian ministers. Kings must not let factions or factious spirits alone, for like bad humours in physical bodies they ought to be purged 'by violence' before bringing on disease.[128] This was an argument clearly in line with the ejection of Nonconforming clergy on Black Bartholomew Day, 1662.

For the writers of national history, the mid seventeenth century testified strongly to the wickedness of resistance to authority and the righteousness of loyalty and obedience. The wars were a great evil for the great slaughter and ruin they wrought: more houses plundered and burnt, more churches profaned and spoiled, and 'more blood poured out like Water' in four years, lamented Heylyn, than in all the decades of the fourteenth-century civil war between the houses of York and Lancaster.[129] As bad, if not worse, than the wars were the unintentional, but ultimately predictable, political and religious consequences of Parliament's revolt.[130] The Long Parliament's defence of the English Reformation from Laudian innovations had led to a flourishing of separatist congregations and radical sects; a struggle to protect the subject's liberties produced a republic and then Cromwell's tyranny.[131] National historians were bemused by how easily 'what was pretended to be fought for' had been lost when the fighting was over, or even as early as when things first 'came into Blood.'[132] For Hobbes the destruction and usurpations that marked the civil war and Interregnum years were a monument to the innate folly of men, tearing down the very institutions which do them good before vainly attempting to set 'something better in [their] place.'[133] To prevent such catastrophes in the future, Hobbes argued, the king needed to understand the true nature of sovereignty, henceforth exercising the firmest control over the dissemination of knowledge and of news, so that the people would never forget their duty to obey.[134]

---

[126] Heylyn, *Aerius*, 77, 260, 464-5.

[127] Although mistaken in attributing the *Vindiciae* to Calvin's successor at Geneva, Theodore Beza, Heylyn's argument about the link between Calvinism and 'resistance theory' seems remarkably prescient when compared to those of modern historians of sixteenth-century political theory, such as Quentin Skinner, 'The origins of the Calvinist theory of revolution' in B. C. Malament (ed.) *After the Reformation: essays in Honor of J. H. Hexter* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 309-30; Robert Kingdon, 'Calvinism and Resistance Theory' in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Political Thought: 1450-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 193-218.

[128] Hobbes, *Behemoth* 95; Heath, *Civil Wars*, sig. A3; Heylyn believed that the condition of Presbyterians in England at the time of James I's accession (1603) was so low that had the king held 'his Reigns with a constant hand,' or had better counsel, he might have suppressed them once and for all, *Aerius*, 369.

Although national historians reminded their readers that public affairs had degenerated into open war and then tyranny, they also recalled that the best of men had demonstrated the virtue of loyalty. During those 'deplorable and unhappy' decades it had been the witness of men such as Strafford, William Laud, Lord Arthur Capel, and the king himself, that honourable Englishmen were ever faithful to their prince and his

---

[129] Heylyn, *Aerius* 480.
[130] Phillips, *Chronicle*, 822.
[131] Bethel, *The world's mistake*, 11-13.
[132] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. A3v; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 770.
[133] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 155, 192.
[134] Hobbes, *Behemoth*, 46, 9, 55, 38.

Church, even to the death.[135] For the writers who told the kingdom's story it was far better for an individual actor to have been obedient and loyal during the troubles than to have enjoyed success in battle or policy; the truly victorious were those who became martyrs for the king's cause.[136]

Making Sense through Personal History

Personal histories were especially concerned with particular individuals who had achieved prominence or notoriety during the 1640s and 1650s; in the cases of Ludlow and Clarendon, the historian dealt with his own experiences. Personal histories usually blamed the upheavals of those years on the plans of a malignant few. A faction of anonymous 'unquiet persons,' according to Charles I's biographer Perrinchief, had transposed the Long Parliament into an instrument that 'ingulfed the Nation in a Sea of Blood;' Heath was willing to name some of them, including his protagonist Cromwell, along with Pym and Hampden. By contrast, Margaret Cavendish blamed the war in which her royalist husband the earl of Newcastle fought on the Long Parliament as a whole.[137] Heylyn believed that the Church of England fell victim to a long-standing Jesuit and puritan conspiracy, which neither Parliament nor the king had done enough to stop, while the martyrologist Lloyd, echoing Davies, detected Richelieu's genius at work in the disturbances in Scotland and England between 1637 and 1642.[138] While not using the term 'faction' in her account of the causes of the civil wars, Hutchinson did imply that a small cadre of men was ultimately responsible for the war's outbreak. Unsurprisingly, given her husband's service for Parliament during the wars, she blamed the popish-leaning house of Stuart for having ambitions of absolute rule and the suppression of the godly. The plan for absolutism originated, she believed, during the Norman Conquest, receiving an unexpected boost from the social divisions wrought by the Reformation.[139]

---

[135] Heath, *Intestine War*, 19; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 584; Davies, *Civil Wars*, 224; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 625. The attention given to Montrose, executed 'for his valour and loyalty' suggests that the writers consider him to be the exemplary Scot of the period; Phillips, *Chronicle*, 648, Davies, *Civil Wars*, 308, and W. C., *Commons Warre*, 100.

[136] For an argument that the dominance of the Christo-centric model of martyrdom after Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* allowed for any innocent victim who suffered for a righteous cause, whether religious or political, to be cast as a genuine martyr see Thomas S. Freeman, 'Imitatio Christi with a Vengeance: The Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early-Modern England' in Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (eds.) *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 51-7.

[137] Perrinchief, *Baslika*, 14, 22, 28; Heath, *Flagellum*, 22, and *Loyal Martyrs*, 7; Cavendish, *Life of William Cavendish*, 8. In Gumble's biography of General Monck the popular rejoicing in London at Charles II's entry was proof that the 'body of the People' had until then been overawed by a 'wicked Faction,' *Monck*, 387.

Religion was clearly a major cause of the troubles as related in personal histories. Cavendish explained that her husband had purged the Durham trained bands of separatist Protestants at the outbreak of hostilities because he knew that most rebellions, wars, and civil disorders were the consequences of 'schism and faction in religion.' The great misfortune of the times, for Gumble, was that the seemingly godly had proved to be rebels, '[kindling] such a Fire' that it consumed the nation's glo[illegible] Reformation was the pretext, the martyrologist Winstanley declared, by which everything was 'turned into confusion' and private ambition disguised by 'instantaneous Sanctity,' most prominently in the case of Cromwell, became the rule of the land.[140] Among the writers of personal histories Heylyn dwelt the longest on the doctrinal origins of the puritan plot, tracing it back to the debate over predestination instigated by Pelagius. The Calvinist position concerning divine foreknowledge of human salvation, which Heylyn characterized as 'predestination unto death or Reprobation,' was not acceptable to the reformed English Church; since the mid sixteenth century the Calvinist view had been rejected by Protestants everywhere but Geneva and northern Britain.[141] Scottish puritans, or Presbyterians, intent on spreading their beliefs, were behind the disturbances over the new prayer book in 1637 and simultaneous rumblings in England about the Archbishop of Canterbury's efforts to bring the Church of England more in line with its true (non-Calvinist) Reformation roots; they were also the chief promoters of the overthrow of Strafford, Laud, also becoming the 'principle incendiaries' of the people against the bishops and later the king.[142] Hutchinson also began her account of the origins of the troubles with the Reformation, arguing that while Queen Elizabeth had made the cause of Protestantism her own, since the Stuarts' accession in 1603, the Court had increasingly distanced itself from any gentleman who 'was zealous for God's worship, could endure a sermon, modest habit or conversation, or anything that was good;' such persons were portrayed as enemies to the king even during the 1630s.[143]

---

[138] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 423-4; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 13, cf. Davies, *Civil Wars*, sig A1v. Heylyn's understanding of the Church's betrayal by both king and Parliament is highlighted by Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-century England: the Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

[139] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 60, 64; Norbrook argues that the connection Hutchinson makes between the Reformation and the increasing power of the gentry show her use of James Harrington's 'sociological' analysis of the origins of the civil war in *Oceana*, 'Hutchinson, Lucy,' *Oxford DNB*, (Online edn, May 2005) article 14285, accessed 15 Jan 2007.

[140] Cavendish, *Life of William Cavendish*, 11; Cavendish also notes that upon marching into Yorkshire with his troops in 1642 the Earl printed a Declaration proclaiming that he fought to preserve the person and government of the king and the 'orthodox church of England,' 14; Gumble, *Monck*, 9; cf. Winstanley, *Martyrology*, 'Preface;' Heath, *Flagellum*, 12.

Several personal histories connected the kingdom's surfeit of peace and plenty during the 1630s with the subsequent descent into war and chaos. 'Too much' happiness was thought to be the cause of civil commotions when the king's biographer Perrinchief compared the felicity of the 1630s with what came after. For Lloyd it was a mark against the English nation that ‘the happiest People under Heaven’ could only respond to the blessings of good government and peace with ‘wantonness and unthankfulness.’ The descent into the evil of civil war was all the more tragic in Clarendon’s view given that England’s flourishing ‘peace and prosperity’ in 1639 were achieved by a prince of ‘the greatest piety and devotion.’[144] By contrast, for Heylyn the highpoint of the time before the wars was the program for the Church set out by the canons passed at the Canterbury Convocation in June 1640; thereafter, according to the natural order of things having been ‘carried to the height,’ both Laud and his Church began to fall.[145]

---

[141] Heylyn claimed that the Church of England accepted 'predestination to life,' *Cyprianus*, 28-30.

[142] *Ibid*. 394, 327, 456. Heylyn's account of a Calvinist-Presbyterian plot to overturn the English Reformation settlement was echoed later in the decade in Lloyd's martyrology; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 3-17.

[143] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 57-8, 65. On the tendency of James I and Charles I's critics to 'mis-remember' Elizabeth I as an ardent supporter of the Protestant cause at home and abroad see John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: literature, history, sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1-28; and Daniel Woolf, 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the late queen's famous memory' *Canadian Journal of History* 20 (1985), 167-91.

The 1630s were not, however, a mythic ‘golden age’ in all personal histories.[146] Hutchinson argued that Charles I’s principled adherence to his bishops and unstinting support for his prerogative rights had alienated the godly from the royal court; eventually the puritans were compelled to ‘the defence of the just English liberties.’[147] Ludlow claimed that by 1640 the ambitions of the king and his prelates were so high that government turned into ‘will and pleasure’ and religion into ‘superstition and idolatry. The war which broke out two years later was the result of the king’s attempt ‘by open force’ to overturn Parliament’s efforts to salvage the nation’s spiritual and civil liberties.[148] Hutchinson and Clarendon both were critical of the king’s acceptance of bad counsel, particularly from his French Catholic queen. Hutchinson thought that nothing but God’s mercy prevented Queen Henrietta Maria from ‘ruling England through’ her husband and joining with Laud to extirpate the godly, and ultimately, Protestantism, from the three Stuart kingdoms, while Clarendon believed that the queen's desire to show that she held the same influence with the king as had the Duke of Buckingham in the 1620s was the foundation 'upon which the first and utmost prejudices to the king and his government were raised and prosecuted.'[149] The king's chequered political past also loomed large, Ludlow claimed, in the Long Parliament's memory, for members recalled Charles I's 'treachery and cruelty' to critics such as Sir John Eliot in 1629. Such memories were the motivation of their unprecedented efforts—including seeking control over the militia—to secure from royal reversal the legislation which protected the reformed religion and the subject's liberties.[150]

---

[144] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 13; Clarendon, *Life*, 66.
[145] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 11; Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 421.
[146] For an argument about how modern national histories can narrate the time before a disruptive event as a kind of ‘myth’ see Frank R. Ankersmit’s ‘The Sublime Dissociation of the Past: or How to Be(come) What One is No Longer’ *History and Theory* 40 (2001), 295-323.
[147] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 67, 64, 75.
[148] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 127-9.

The beginning of a personal history usually began with the protagonist's birth. The small amount of space devoted to the protagonist's childhood was understandable since a person's early years were not thought especially important for his or her later life.[151] For example, Heath dealt with Cromwell's first thirty years, including his 'raucous and violent youth,' in fewer than twenty pages.[152] The historians' lack of interest in their protagonists' youth also reflected a judgement about the relationship between the arrival of the nation's troubles and the significance of the protagonist's life: it was truly in the context of the former that the latter became meaningful. This was reinforced in the collective personal histories such as Lloyd's *Memoirs of the Lives*, in which an account of a particular individual usually began at the time when he started to suffer for or struggle to defend his principles, which was almost always after 1640.[153] Heylyn's life of Archbishop Laud was the striking exception. The first part of the work used over two hundred pages to reach Laud's accession to Canterbury in 1633 at age sixty, and another two hundred to the bring the story up to the conclusion of the June 1640 Convocation; in the second part the remaining five years of the Archbishop's life were treated in less than one hundred pages.[154] The chronological map of Heylyn's biography thus reflected the reality of Laud's departure from the sphere of high politics with his arrest in December 1640, Heylyn's need to establish Laud's Protestant credentials, as well as the historian's belief that the story of Laud's rise and fall was a metaphor for the origins of the civil war.[155]

---

[149] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 69-70, 74; Clarendon, *Life*, 158.
[150] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 127-8. Sir John Eliot was a sharp critic of the Duke of Buckingham in the 1620s, and read out three resolutions, including one against innovations in religion, on 2 March 1629 while the Speaker of the Commons was held down in his chair. Following the dissolution of Parliament he was arrested, tried, fined, and died in prison.
[151] This point was suggested by J. R. Jones.
[152] These figures are derived from counting pages in the respective works. In a twentieth century edition of Cavendish's biography of the earl of Newcastle his pre-civil war life was covered in seven pages.

Personal histories tended to date the beginning of the troubles to one of two key events, which indicated which party or institution they believed was most to blame for their outbreak. The outbreak of the Scottish Covenanter revolt in 1637-38 was for Heath the first flame of the combustions that soon engulfed Britain and Ireland, while both Hutchinson and Clarendon used a meteorological metaphor when describing the Scottish disturbances as the 'forerunners of the dreadful storm' that unleashed an unstoppable 'deluge of wickedness and rebellion' in England.[156] Alternatively, it was the opening of the Long Parliament in November 1640 that unleashed the floodwaters of ruin and war, as in Perrinchief's biography, or, from another view, started an operation to rescue religion and liberty as in the stories written by Hutchinson and Ludlow.[157] A number of personal histories also considered the problem of blame by focusing on when the breakdown of normal politics had happened. In Ludlow's account war became imminent when the king started preparing an army against Parliament after his departure from London in January 1642 (1641 in contemporary reckoning). Hutchinson wrote that 'fierce contests and disputes, almost to blood' broke out when localities had to choose between Parliament's militia ordinance and the king's commissions of array. For Clarendon, the tipping point came in early 1642 when the 'insolent sort' in Parliament realized they could not back down from their demands without condemning themselves, losing their honour, and forfeiting their popular support.[158]

---

[153] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*: for example, the story of Viscount Falkland, royal propagandist, commences with his reunion with Charles I at York in 1641 at page 331, and ends with his death at the battle of Newberry in 1643 at page 334; in the case of Laud, Lloyd begins with a survey of the prelate's virtues, pages 225-232, before listing the articles of impeachment against him.

[154] Part II begins on page 421; by page 505 Heylyn had narrated Laud's trial and execution; he concluded the work with three pages of commentary on Laud's faults.

[155] Anthony Milton, 'Laud, William (1573-1645),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005), [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/16112, accessed 29 Jan 2007]

[156] Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 128, 144-8; cf. Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 2, and Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 17; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 56, 71; Clarendon, *Life*, 66. An earlier instance of the Scottish revolt as the first 'clouds of war' is in the historiographer royal James Howell's *Twelve Several Treatises, of the late revolutions in* the *three Kingdoms; deducing the Causes thereof from their Originals*. (London: 1661), sig. B8; the *Twelve Several Treatises* were reprinted from tracts written and published before the Restoration.

By ending their story at or after the king's return, several personal histories demonstrated a desire to account for the wars from the perspective of the Restoration. Eglesfield's biography of Charles II, published in the autumn of 1660, and the first part of Clarendon's *Life*, both ended with the king back on his throne.[159] The stories of Ludlow, Clarendon, John Hutchinson, General Monck, and the earl of Newcastle

---

For more on Howell's career and thought see Daniel Woolf, 'Conscience, Constancy, and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell' in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G.E. Aylmer* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 243-78.

[157] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 14; similarly, Heylyn dated the decline of Laud and the Church from the autumn of 1640, *Cyprianus*, 421; Ludlow, *Voyce*, 127; Hutchinson, 33.

[158] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 84; Ludlow, *Voyce*, 128; Cavendish blamed the king's departure from London on Parliament's fury, *Life of William Cavendish*, 10; Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 26; Clarendon, *Life*, 108, 110. Further along in his memoir Clarendon recalled that the 'violent party' in Parliament thought war was at hand with Charles I's march on Hull in April 1642; 'for they considered their own actions as done only to prevent a war, by making the king unable to make it, who as they thought only desired it.'

[159] Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 230. The second part of Clarendon's *Life* covers the years of his service as Lord Chancellor to Charles II, 1660 to 1667; Firth, 'Clarendon's History…Continued,' 262. See also Ian Green, 'The Publication of Clarendon's Autobiography and the acquisition of his papers by the Bodleian Library' *Bodleian Library Record* 10 (1982), 349-67.

continued for varying lengths after 1660.[160] Perrinchief brought Charles I's story up to 1662 by reminding readers that 'his own seed' was currently sitting on the throne.[161] In Heath's account of Cromwell's life the history ended not with the Protector's death in 1658 but with the exhumation and dismemberment of his corpse in January 1661.[162] The collections of stories of suffering royalists (and noxious Parliamentarians) assembled by Heath, Winstanley, and Lloyd each take into account, though to different lengths, events which took place after the 'happy Revolution' of 1660. For example, Heath notes that Bishop Matthew Wren of Ely, imprisoned by the Long Parliament in 1641, was freed thanks to General Monck in 1660 and is 'now re-established in his same Diocese;' Lloyd's short biography of Wren ends with his burial in Cambridge in 1667 'with the greatest solemnity seen in the memory of man.'[163] The majority of the personal stories within these collective biographies, however, end with the death of the loyal sufferer well before the return of Charles II from his travels.

As in national histories, the turning points and counterfactuals highlighted by a personal history showed which moments between the beginning and end of the troubles were particularly important and therefore memorable for understanding what had happened. Heylyn insisted that the troubles could have been avoided, and Laud's life spared, if only the king had used more force to suppress the Scottish Covenanting revolt, or else had held the Parliament at York instead of Westminster.[164] Parliament's victory at the battle of Marston Moor in June 1644 was, according to Cavendish, a profound turning point not only for the king's cause in the North but also in the life of the earl of Newcastle, who had resolved thereafter to flee the kingdom, having foreseen that the 'loss of that fatal battle' was the undoing of the royalist cause.[165] Several writers indicated the momentous importance of Charles I's decision to ignore his bishops' counsel and accede to the execution of Strafford; the earl's removal, Lloyd believed, left the king without his strongest defender against the Faction. Heath thought Strafford's death was the preparative for more radical attempts to overthrow the *status quo* in state and church.[166] Another crucial turning point in the story of Charles I and his cause, was his choice to use one of his armies to besiege the city of Gloucester in the summer of 1643, halting what appeared to be its unstoppable progress toward London.[167]

---

[160] The Bodleian manuscript of Ludlow's *Voyce* takes its author's tale well into the 1670s. John Hutchinson died (in prison) in 1664, and George Monck (Duke of Albermarle) in 1671. William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle from 1665, lived ten years after the first publication of his *Life* in 1667.

[161] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 58. Heylyn was again the exception, stopping with Laud's death in 1646; *Cyprianus*, 508.

[162] Heath, *Flagellum*, sig. Q8v. For a modern discussion of the contemporary importance of exhuming the corpse of Cromwell and fellow regicides John Bradshaw and Henry Ireton in January 1661 see Laura Lungers Knoppers's *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 167-92.

[163] Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 447; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 612; Winstanley included a short account of the capture of the regicides Colonel Okey and Miles Corbet in the Netherlands and their subsequent execution in April 1662, *Loyal Martyrology*, 115.

The most memorable point of the king's story in Perrinchief's biography, and the martyrologies of Heath, Winstanley and Lloyd, was invariably his trial and execution.[168] These writers narrated Charles I's final days using the tropes of redemptive suffering drawn from the Bible and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*: having been defeated on the field of battle the king triumphed over his enemies by dying for the people with a Christ-like patience and charity that Winstanley believed 'will be had in everlasting remembrance.'[169] By contrast, the republican historians Hutchinson and Ludlow both situated the king's end within another biblical trajectory, the necessity outlined in Numbers 33 'to bring the authour of so much blood the King to justice, as a tyrant, traytor, murderer, and enemy to the Comonwealth.'[170] Ludlow believed that, had Parliament taken decisive action against Charles I at the end of the first war in 1646, the second one would not have occurred two years later, and that a third war, 'or worse, the giving up of the cause unto him,' would have resulted from showing the king mercy in 1649.[171]

---

[164] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 334, 428-9.

[165] Cavendish, *Life of William Cavendish*, 41. Unlike Margaret Cavendish, most personal histories dated the decline of the king's military fortunes to the 'memorable battle' of Naseby, at which the king's letters were discovered and afterwards printed; Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 37; Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 14; Heath, *Flagellum*, 39; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 200, Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 186-7.

[166] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 17; Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 9; cf. Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 5. While Heylyn was willing to put Strafford's execution down to bad counsel and 'humane frailty,' the king's biographer, Perrinchief, suggested that Charles I was the true victim in the sad affair, the earl having been 'ravished from him' by his enemies; Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 452; Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 69. Jacqueline Rose suggests that the relative weight which an author put on the role of 'bad counsel' in Strafford's death might also reflect the strength of his belief in the need for Charles II to avoid a similar mistake.

[167] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 105; Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 476; later in the text Heylyn implies that the king repeated the same mistake the following year (June 1644) when he did not head straight for London after the battle of Cropredy Bridge, 490. Perrinchief, Lloyd, and Clarendon blamed Charles I's counsellors for the lost opportunity to crush the Parliamentary leaders, the latter writer deploying a characteristic recourse to the passive voice to refer to '[those] who had judged only the improbability of relieving Gloucester…found themselves deceived' by the arrival of Parliament's army; Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 71; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 185; Clarendon, *Life*, 173.

[168] Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 167-208. Clarendon's *Life* did not narrative the king's trial directly and so it does not become a major turning point in his narrative.

A number of personal histories also brought out key intersections between their protagonists' lives and great national events. For example, the petition from the New Model Army to Parliament in November 1648 demanding arrears and justice upon the king was the beginning of the 'greatest of our woes' according to Eglesfield; for Perrinchief and Lloyd the regicide meant the end of liberty in the three kingdoms.[172] The person who most memorably represented the irregularity and illegitimacy of the Interregnum was Oliver Cromwell.[173] The key junctures of Cromwell's personal story and the national narrative were his role in the dissolution of Parliament in April 1653, his assumption of the title Lord Protector in 1654, and his refusal to accept the crown in 1657.[174] For the republican Hutchinson the decisive moment of the early 1650s was the 'unhappy interruption' of the nation's peace and prosperity wrought by Cromwell's taking of power, while in the royalist Heath's biography of the general-turned-tyrant the 'critical time' for both his subject and the nation occurred when the Protector refused to become Oliver I.[175] The other major personality from the 1650s whose actions and decisions reverberated throughout the nation was General George Monck. The former Cromwellian general's declaration for a 'free Parliament' on 11 February 1660 had provoked memorable rejoicing in London and across the nation; these festivities were perceived to be preliminary celebrations of the impending Restoration.[176] What was most remarkable about Monck was the inscrutability of his intentions during the first months of 1660. For Hutchinson and Ludlow, the General's eventual declaration for the king was evidence of his dissimulation and treachery, while his former chaplain Thomas Gumble took considerable space in his biography to prove that Monck had intended the king's restoration from the moment he agreed to serve Cromwell, and that his ambiguity was intentional and necessary to effect the good work of restoring the king.[177]

---

[169] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 54-6; cf. Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 'A King that when most conquered was more than Conqueror over himself,' 185; Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 16, 20. The martyrological reading of Charles I's death largely dates from the publication of the 'king's book,' *Eikon Basilike*, a few days after the execution; Lacey, *Cult of King Charles*, 46-7

[170] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 234-5; Ludlow, *Voyce*, 130-1; see Patricia Crawford's '"Charles Stuart, that Man of Blood"' *Journal of British Studies* 16 (1977), 41-61, for the importance of this doctrine among soldiers and chaplains in the New Model army in 1647-8.

[171] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 142, 145. Ludlow evidently did not think the invasion of an army of Scots with Charles II at its head in the summer of 1651 constituted a 'third civil war.'

[172] Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 44; Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 58, and Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 220.

[173] In this Hutchinson was in agreement with Lloyd and Perrinchief, *Memoirs*, 253-6, 262.

While not all the people discussed by personal historians had as much influence on the course of national events as Monck, Cromwell, and Charles I, it is clear that personal historians believed their protagonists deserved, and needed, to be remembered in the future. These histories commemorated the lives of others or themselves through narratives which showed not only the relation of 'those lesser wheels' to 'the great orb' of national affairs, but which also suggested how the great revolutions of the troubled times might be understood through the story of one person.[178] For example, in Heath's *Flagellum*, Cromwell was a wicked tyrant whose ambition is harnessed by the Lord for a season to punish the nation for its sins. Gumble's life of the Cromwellian warrior turned royal restorer George Monck is a *eucatastrophe*, a tragedy that becomes a comedy in the same way that the cross leads to resurrection in the Gospels and regicide led to Restoration.[179] In Hutchinson's account of her husband John, the Colonel's actions during his struggles with Presbyterians while governor of Nottingham, his retirement under Cromwell's Protectorate, and finally his commitment to the cause of grace, spiritual worship and gospel liberty during imprisonment after the Restoration, made him an exemplar for oppressed Nonconformists.[180] Similar stories of constancy, sacrifice, and good deaths made up most of the material in the collections assembled by Heath, Winstanley and Lloyd. Thus, for the writers of personal stories in the 1660s the principles for which their protagonists fought and died, or which their stories exemplified, were the keys for making sense of their lives and of the troubles as a whole.

---

[174] Perrinchief and Health suggested Cromwell's ambitions underlay the regicide, *Basilika*, 43; *Flagellum*, 53; Gumble, *Monck*, 73. On Oliver's second investment as Lord Protector in 1657 see Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 202.

[175] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 236, 252; Heath thought Oliver did the nation a favour in killing the Rump, *Flagellum*, 135, 192.

[176] Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 223; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*,

[177] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 272; Ludlow, *Voyce*, 146; Gumble, *Monck*, 120-3; for example, Gumble claimed that had Monck declared openly for the king in 1659 he would have got the English army to unite against him, and the Restoration would have been delayed or brought about by violence.

Exemplary principles in Personal Histories

---

[178] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 104.

[179] For an analysis of the dominance of tragicomedy on Restoration stages see Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy: 1660-1671*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[180] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 286; Keeble, 'Introduction,' xx.

Personal histories conveyed clear morals that readers were to remember from the civil wars and Interregnum. The workings of divine providence were pointed out in a number of histories. When Heylyn concluded his summation of the decisions made by Charles I in the summer of 1640 which were 'contrary to all reason of State and Civil Prudence' he could make sense of them by confessing that such things had been handed down 'by the supreme and over-ruling power of Providence.'[181] In his *Life* Clarendon included an anecdote of Sir Edmund Verney's wish to be killed for obeying his master the king, and thereby betraying his conscience by defending the bishops; it was fulfilled within two months at Edgehill.[182] Perrinchief believed that the troubles started when God permitted the wicked to flourish for a season, but when they had brought the nation 'to the brinks of destruction' the Lord intervened to restore the monarchy.[183] Likewise, Gumble argued that while the General was the 'chief instrument' of the king's return, God was indeed the 'great Restorer' as evident in the failure of Lambert's rising in April 1660. 'It is to own providence,' that is, to acknowledge its government of human history, the chaplain declared, 'to remember those that are subservient to it.'[184] The owning of providence is precisely what Hutchinson and Ludlow struggled to achieve in their narratives. The same God to whom appeal had been made during the controversy between king and Parliament, and who had clearly judged in favour of the latter in 1645 and 1648, had apparently brought about the 'great change' of the Restoration by fostering division among the godly and frustrating all plans to uphold the Commonwealth. The Lord could still show favour to his people, such as Colonel Hutchinson, by giving them assurance of the rightness of their cause, and patience while they waited for him to prosper it once again.[185]

---

[181] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 429.

[182] Clarendon, *Life*, 134; on the trope of wish-fulfillment in providentialist literature see Walsham, *Providence*, 82-5; a fuller discussion of providentialism in Clarendon's work is in Michael Finlayson, 'Clarendon, providence and historical revolution' *Albion* 22 (1990), 607-32.

[183] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 13, 72-73. Eglesfied invoked The Lord's wrath to account both for the failure of the nation to rise to Charles II's aid before the battle of Worcester, and his 'deliverance' afterwards, claiming that God's owning of the royal cause was never more apparent than in the king's escape, *Monarchy Revived*, 115; cf. Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 102, 104, 115, 142-3.

[184] Gumble, *Monck*, 280, 486. Lloyd thought it a great example of divine providence that those who had 'divided the hearts of the People from him in his prosperity,' Sir John Hotham and his son, should have their heads severed for helping the king in his distress, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 704.

Personal histories also demonstrated the principles of the danger excessive popular participation in public affairs posed to the polity. Historians reminded readers how great numbers of 'the Rabble' or 'mad multitude' had with their 'rude assemblies' cowed the Lords into voting for Strafford's Attainder, cried against Laud and other bishops, spewed fury at the liturgy, and had even dared to roar that the king should not control the militia. It was such 'poor Tradesmen and decayed citizens; deluded and priest-ridden women, and discontented spirits' whose tumultuous actions in London in 1640-41 Lloyd identified with the 'Good Old Cause' against law, religion, and the king.[186] The excessive religious zeal and the hypocritical spirituality of the king's enemies demonstrated the puritan movement's threat to public safety. For example, Perrinchief criticized the Long Parliament for permitting 'all Sects and Heresies' freedom to preach and teach; this in turn fostered the schisms, separations, and misunderstandings that Cromwell would use to maintain his power.[187] The Protector's tyranny was more pernicious than other historic usurpers, Heath believed, because it derived so much of its potency from his 'Religious Austerity' and 'morose Holyness.'[188] The principles for which the godly and Parliament had fought, the security of religion and liberty, were simply cloaks for their pride and ambition.[189] It was the nature of the troubles that began with the Scottish Covenanter revolt, Gumble declared, that those who seemed 'most godly' were often the worst of men.[190] This was also evident in the story of the Parliamentarian and republican Colonel John Hutchinson, who took up the post as military governor of Nottingham simply out of a desire to serve God and defend his county. While acting in this capacity Hutchinson was afflicted almost continually by so-called 'zealots for God and Parliament,' that is, the Presbyterians, who resented his protection of separatist congregations of sober men; the Presbyterians eventually betrayed the Good Old Cause and gospel liberty in 1660 by supporting the king's return.[191]

---

[185] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 89, 114, 123, 129; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 287, 303, 331. Ludlow and Hutchinson would have distinguished between God's general providence over all people and his special providence concerning the elect; Worden, 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*,' 130.
[186] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 20, 22; Heath, *Flagellum*, 22, 42-3; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 12, and 17.
[187] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 18, 29, 32, 62; Heath, *Flagellum*, sig. A2v,
[188] Heath, *Flagellum*, sig. A5.

Another lesson to be learned from the recent past was the need periodically to purge dangerous humours from the body politic. This principle emerged in Heylyn's story of Laud as a counterfactual: so much suffering, death, and destruction could have been prevented if the Scottish malefactors had been cut off like 'unsound and putrified members.' In Ludlow and Hutchinson this principle is highlighted in their accounts of the king's trial and execution, in which Charles I becomes the biblical 'man of blood' whose death was necessary to cleanse the land and the people from sanguineous pollution.[192] Within royalist personal histories the civil wars and Interregnum were negative proofs of the world-upholding doctrine of Romans 13, that it is 'upon no pretence lawful' to resist authority.' The wickedness of rebellion 'upon what pretence soever' was demonstrated in the story of a kingdom transformed by a malignant faction from a civil community into 'a boscage of Wild and brutall creatures,' who slew each other before doing what even pagans dared not, murdering their anointed king. For these sins the Lord had visited them with the scourge of Cromwell.[193] At last, after 'horrid scandals to religion' and unprecedented violence wreaked upon law and right, the people sobered up and returned to their allegiance.[194] Having been for far too long the passive victims of conspirators and religious zealots, the nation finally remembered itself by calling for and then joyously welcoming the return of the king.

---

[189] Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 'Preface,'; Eglesfield, *Monarchy Revived*, 11.
[190] Gumble, *Monck*, 9.
[191] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 160, 167, 184.
[192] Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 330-31; Ludlow, *Voyce*, 132-3; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 234-5.

Personal histories proved that sinful times such as England's troubles led to great suffering for many people. The particular action that brought an individual to suffer, or to die in battle, or to be executed, however, was less important for the historian than the fact that it was for the sake of the truth.[195] The purpose of the collective biographies of Heath, Winstanley, and Lloyd was to make loyalty to King and Church as well as adherence to the Protestant faith causes for English martyrdom.[196] The story and its characters were simply vehicles to convey an eternal verity.[197] For example, Heath included accounts of Robert Yeomans and George Bowcher of Bristol, executed by Nathaniel Fiennes for attempting to hand over the city to the king during the first civil war, Christopher Love, a Presbyterian divine killed for conspiring against the Republic, and Colonel John Penruddock, who was executed after a failed rising against Cromwell; in each case the

---

[193] Heath, *Flagellum*, sig. A2v, 21; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 60.
[194] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 704.
[195] As Brad S. Gregory reminds historians of early modern religion, the purpose of martyrology was to make explicit the correspondence between right doctrine, authentic martyrdom, and the identity of true Christians; *Salvation at Stake: Christian martyrdom in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Pres, 1999), 145-54, 320-39.
[196] Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, sig. A5; Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 14-7; Winstanley, 'Preface.'
[197] For an exploration of this phenomenon in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* see Daniel Woolf, 'The Rhetoric of Martyrdom: Generic Contradictions in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* ' in Thomas F. Mayer and D. R. Woolf (eds.) *The rhetorics of Life-writing in Early Modern Europe: Forms of Biography from Cassandra Fedele to Louis XIV* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 243-82.

'only crime' of which they were guilty was loyalty to the king.[198] Heath's use of the term 'crime' was probably intentional, meant to demonstrate the 'upside-down' nature of the troubles; during those years rebellion was right and virtuous men were slain. Likewise, the inclusion of memorable documents in these collections, such as the text for the erection of the High Court of Justice, allowed Lloyd to highlight the absurdity which then reigned: the king being charged with subverting the constitution and liberties of the realm by men who 'overthrowed all the laws of this nation.'[199] But what the royalist martyrologists implied through their narratives of men crushed because of the wickedness of the times was that revolt is not wrong when loyalty to the king is made illegal. Therefore, to have risen or conspired against the Rump or Protectorate was not in fact to have revolted.

Hutchinson's story of the life and death of Colonel Hutchinson, by contrast, showed the virtue of constancy to the principle of gospel liberty in face of all opposition. She conveyed this in part by noting the clear conviction of the Colonel's conscience at different moments in his history, as when, for example, in 1642 he became convinced of the justice of Parliament's cause 'in point of civil right,' and in the following year when his conscience was so firmly persuaded 'of the cause' that he took the position of governor of Nottingham. While serving as a Member of the Commons during the intense struggles in Parliament during the later 1640s no man, not even his closest friend, could make John Hutchinson do anything 'without a full persuasion of [his] conscience.' Following the Restoration the former Parliamentarian reflected deeply upon 'all that was past' fearing that at some point he might have slid into error, but the more the Colonel

---

[198] Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 98, 330, 405.
[199] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 196; the author's 'deconstructions' of the Act are set as marginal notes to the main text, perhaps thereby to serve as mnemonic glosses.

'examined the cause from the first,' Hutchinson wrote, 'the more he became confirmed' in the principles of religious and civil liberty. When he was imprisoned after the Northern rising of 1663 John Hutchinson remained convinced of his innocence and the rightness of his cause, and was to die with the 'blessed peace and joy which crowns the Lord's constant martyrs.'[200]

After 1660 historians from across the political spectrum had to come to terms with the experience of defeat; for royalists it was their losing the civil wars, while for republicans and the godly it was their losing political power at the Restoration. The recourse to martyrology both by royalist and by Parliamentarian personal historians was a way for them to uphold their side's honour in the present.[201] Commemorating martyrs suggested that it was always more virtuous to lose on the side of right than to triumph with the wrong.[202] This notion turns up in Perrinchief's assessment of the royalists' defeat at Naseby, which, he claimed, while fatally diminishing the king's power, enhanced the king's honour. Margaret Cavendish clearly believed that her husband, the earl of Newcastle, was a virtuous loser. He had fled the country after his army lost at Marston Moor 'rather than submit to the enemy and die,' and although consequently spared a martyr's fate, his time in exile was a kind of righteous suffering.[203] In Lloyd's account of the earl of Litchfield, the royalist defender of the kingdom's constitution died a martyr to that cause wherein 'it was [a] greater honour to be Conquered' than to be conqueror.[204] The only woman mentioned in Winstanley's collection had died during the storming of Basing House to her 'own eternal renown and Honour.'[205] Similarly, Hutchinson at the conclusion of her husband's story declared that the Colonel's memory would endure among all good men who seek to preserve, and to remember, such an exemplary life of virtue and honour.[206]

---

[200] Hutchinson, 75, 102, 207, 286, 321, 331, 336. As David Norbrook points out, part of Hutchinson's strategy in portraying her husband's constancy throughout the troubles and early Restoration is to exonerate the Colonel's wavering from the regicide and republican principles in and before 1660, 'Republican civility,' 73; cf. Derek Hirst's 'Remembering a Hero: Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs* of her Husband' *English Historical Review*, 119 (2002), 682-91.

[201] Remembering the 'faithful' who gave their lives as payment to the ravenous Revolution in the 1790s was a key component of 'le souvenir obligé' in the Vendée after the Bourbon restoration; see Jean-Clément Martin, *La Vendée de la mémoire (1800-1980)* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989), 78-9.

[202] Thomas Freeman argues that one of the consequences of the politicization of martyrdom was allowing losers to accept better their defeat on the side of right; 'Imitatio Christi,' 68. Ludlow becomes a kind of martyrologist when he writes up the story of the trials and executions of the regicides, for example, *Voyce*, 201-15.

To be a martyr in personal histories was to win honour by losing and dying for the right principles.[207] The implication of these accounts was that in the future honour would belong to those who had adhered to the truth, not necessarily to the winning side; this was surely a consolation both for royalists who were required to remember losing the wars and the king's 'murder,' and republicans such as Ludlow who, after the experience of defeat, now had to 'wayt the Lord's tyme.'[208] In these stories losing on the right side in fact became a way to win, since it was, and would be, commemorated and for ever celebrated. Thus the losers who triumphed in 1660, among whom numbered old Presbyterian Parliamentarians (winners in 1646 but losers in 1648), and the winners for whom that year blasted their hopes, came to terms with their defeats through martyrs who embodied the values and principles of their cause.[209]

---

[203] Perrinchief, *Basilika*, 37; Cavendish, *Life of William Cavendish*, 40-41, 57, 64. On the importance of the 'heroic image' for Cavendish's self-understanding as a royalist writer see Hero Chalmers's *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 55.

[204] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 328.

[205] Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 67; without any sense of irony Winstanley did not give the woman's name, apart from saying she was Dr Griffith's daughter. She had been 'slain by the barbarity of the enemies and shamefully left naked as a trophy of their baseness.'

[206] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 337.

[207] Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, 339.

[208] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 108. It is probably that at least some royalists would have recalled the time between 1645 and 1659 when the argument that rebellions never succeed seemed disproved; G. E. Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid-Seventeenth Century England, II: Royalist Attitudes' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series* 37 (1987), 17.

Conclusion: making sense through moralization

That historical writers in the 1660s strove to remind readers that the future would revere the memory of the truly virtuous brings us at last to consider how these stories about the recent troubles could have shaped readers' sense of the connection between the past and the present. It was no easy thing for national and personal historians writing in the 1660s to compass an experience of disunity within a sensible unity of time and space. The realities of civil war and political upheaval could be so disorienting as to confound efforts to narrate them.[210] The historians surveyed in this chapter surmounted this problem by writing stories with morals. By narrating events and individuals from the recent past as essentially analogous to timeless truths the historical writers were able to transcend the breach represented by the turmoil of those years.[211]

The troubles made sense if one understood them to be particular instantiations of general principles. In other words, what bound England's or an individual's past and present and future together were timeless values that had been vividly demonstrated by what had happened from 1640 to 1660. For example, the origins of the wars showed that factions must not be allowed to flourish, or that the nation should not remain insensitive to happiness and peace, that the Lord will punish his people for their sins, or that excessive reliance upon the prerogative threatens liberty and the gospel. Political chaos had been the consequence of the poorer sort forgetting their place in the social hierarchy, and true religion ruined thanks to the plotting of hypocritical religious purists. Resistance to authority and rebellion turned the world upside down, making truth into lies, good into vice, loyalty into treason, and loyal men into martyrs. And (literally) above all, providence controlled the direction of events, most memorably in 1649 and again in 1660. God had allowed the rebels to win, Lloyd declared, so that in time they would, as in all rebellions, become divided and fall into ruin.[212] The civil wars and Interregnum were thus witness to a remarkably high number of providential interventions in political developments, another sign perhaps of God's special concern for the English nation.

---

[209] The 'losers' and 'winners' were not monolithic groups; many of the 'winners' of the wars, such as London's Presbyterians and other 'Reformed Protestants,' were active in killing the Republic in early 1660; see Hutton, *Restoration*, 91-113, and De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, 20-65. Many of these latter-day royalists were to experience bitter disappointment and defeat as a consequence of the Restoration settlements, particularly in religion; De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, 84-92; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 132-44; Harris, *Restoration*, 83.

[210] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Thomas May and the narrative of the civil war' in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.) *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 112, 144.

[211] Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 48-50.

Public affairs between 1640 and 1660 could be understood as memorably irregular and unprecedented. Nevertheless, national and personal histories were able to connect what had happened to general principles, which made the troubled times less of a rupturing of England's national story.[213] Furthermore, the fact that these principles were universal meant that they extended and operated from-before the troubles and into the future; consequently, the likelihood of a repetition of the troubles was ever-present. These histories therefore not only recorded and commemorated aspects of the troubled past, but also conveyed warnings about the future. Remembering the civil wars and Interregnum in light of these exemplary narratives also implied keeping in mind the danger of another civil war. The danger remained because the principles which explained the recent upheaval continued to exist in the present. We might say that, like an emblem of human mortality, these histories mapped the constant reality of another conflagration onto the present and future.[214] For example, by 1667 Hobbes was worried that England's Nonconforming Protestants, former Presbyterians and Independents, might return the people to their former disobedience in light of the recent disasters of plague, fire, and defeat at the hands of the Dutch.[215] Heath, Sprat, and (arguably) Bethel highlighted the peril of religious hypocrisy leading to tyranny and spiritual anarchy, which for Bethel, thinking in particular about Cromwell, also proved the connection between prosperity and the true Protestant interest.[216] The memorable 'Jesuit principles' of the 'Good Old Cause' that had triumphed for a time were laid out for readers of Lloyd's *Memoirs of the Lives* without any assurance that they might not rise again to overturn the king and his laws.[217] The royalist martyrologies were almost certainly written to justify the expulsion from the Church of Nonconforming ministers in 1662, and the penal legislation barring Dissenters from worshipping in public.

---

[212] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 379-80; for this truism the martyrologist also drew on Machiavelli's *Prince* (1.2 c. 3) and Livy (1.6 c 2 § 3).
[213] Rüsen, *History*, 12-4.

In the national histories, which were largely composed by authors sympathetic to the king and his cause, readers were invited to remember the recent past according the principles of obedience to the king and his Church. This royalist narrative encouraged them also to identify themselves now and in the future with such principles, and not to forget who was to blame for the nation's recent discords.[218] In royalist histories blame was placed upon people who adhered to dangerous principles, such as that subjects may resist authority, a wicked king may be punished, that rulers are accountable to the people, and the Church may dispense with bishops and the lowly sort may form their own congregations. In the two personal histories written by republicans, Hutchinson and Ludlow, the blame was reversed; their side were the true defenders of religion and civil right, who had obeyed the Lord by removing the man of blood Charles Stuart from the land. The wars had happened because the Court and the prelates gave themselves over to arbitrary will and popery; these two parties subsequently resented the efforts of the godly and the Long Parliament to protect the gospel and civil rights, so much so that the king and the Episcopals began the war in order to bring the reformation to a halt. Hutchinson and Ludlow's cause was God's until the hard revolution of 1660.[219]

---

[214] William E. Engel applies the phrase to contemporary emblems of mortality in his *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 54-7.

[215] Wootton, 'Hobbes's Machavellian Moments,' 220-26. It is also possible to read *Behemoth* in the context of Clarendon's fall, also occurring in 1667, as recently suggested by Paul Seaward. In that case the purpose of Hobbes's history might have been to convince the king that in light of the danger posed by the Anglican doctrine of passive obedience, just as destabilizing as 'Calvinist resistance theory,' the relationship between church and state ought to be renegotiated; Paul Seaward, '"Chief Ways of God": Form and Meaning in the *Behemoth* of Thomas Hobbes' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 169-188.

[216] Heath, *Flagellum*, sig. A5; Sprat, *Royal Society*, 42, 53, 57; Bethel, *The world's mistake*, 13-17

[217] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 14.

Historical writing from both sides of the conflict therefore reminded readers of the identities of the guilty and the innocent. All the blame for the troubles belongs to 'the other' party, which assumed the role of the scapegoat in the narrative. The accusatory mode is strongest in the stories composed by Hobbes, Heylyn and Ludlow, which also contained the clearest calls for the necessity of blood sacrifice to purge the body politic of contagion.[220] The published histories that identified the innocent and the guilty were at least following the example of selective forgetting laid out by the Act of Oblivion and the 30 January commemorations, which allowed for public remembrances of those guilty for the regicide, and the principles which underlay it.[221] By contrast, the unpublished histories written by Hutchinson and Ludlow circulated among a much smaller readership, proclaiming the innocence of the elect before the throne of God, while hoping that one day the Lord would remember his suffering people and wreak a holy vengeance on a wicked generation.[222]

---

[218] Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 17; on the similar agenda of sixteenth-century Protestant martyrologists see Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, 171-4.

[219] Ludlow, *Voyce*, 127-30.

[220] Davies's *Civil Wars* also suggests the necessity of purging the body politic of noxious humours, sig. A3. On sacrifice see René Girard *Violence and the Sacred*, Translated by Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), and *The Scapegoat*, Translated by Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).

While Restoration Remembrancers reminded the public that the future would indeed hold the memory of the truly virtuous, thousands of king's former soldiers demanded the nation presently remember and reward their faithful service. It is to the stories of these men, and the records and reminders of the civil wars borne on their flesh, to which the following chapter turns.

---

[221] Paulina Kewes, "Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion,' 119.
[222] Worden, 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*,' 11-56; on the notion of God's punishment of the wicked as a form of 'holy terrorism' in Dissenting Protestant literature see Achinstein, *Literature in the Age of Milton*, 101-110.

IV.

Painful Memories: narratives of injury in the petitions and on the bodies of royalist veterans, 1660-1690

Historical writers were not alone in wanting to remind the public about the horrors of the late troubles. This chapter provides a qualitative analysis of the testimonies of royalist war veterans, their widows, their comrades and commanders, and their neighbours conveyed on petitions and certificates. Through these documents maimed soldiers remembered their former service and wounding to secure for themselves a public benefit—a pension—thus providing additional evidence of the selective nature of forgetting and remembering the wars after 1660. Furthermore, maimed soldiers' petitions suggest that the veterans became themselves public corporeal commemorations of particular aspects of the troubled times, which the nation's governors hoped would encourage the people to remember in the future the importance of loyalty.

*

The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was grudgingly confirmed in 1661 by the newly elected 'Cavalier' Parliament.'[1] Very soon, however, the late king's former soldiers petitioned Parliament not to forget their sufferings for his cause; in 1662 Parliament granted the request of maimed royalist veterans and enacted a county-based pension scheme to assist them.[2] That autumn a former royalist corporal named John Wright presented a petition to the Chester Justices of the Peace. On this document Wright declared that he had 'received a great shot in the arm' at the battle of Edgehill in October 1642; he claimed that the bullet was lodged in his flesh 'to this day.' The next year Henry Nicholls of Totnes, Devonshire, submitted a petition to his local magistrates in which he recalled that while fighting in the civil wars he lost his vision in one eye from a musket shot. A decade later back in Cheshire, one Robert Needham of Prestbury presented to the magistrates his petition on which he asserted that during his service for King Charles I 'of never dyeing memorie' his right hand was maimed by a 'shott which hee then received.' Similarly, in 1686, the second year of James II's reign, the judicial Bench meeting at Pontefract learned from a petition submitted by the elderly John Moore of Sheffield that his present 'low and weak condition' had been caused by a 'very dangerous shott into his left breast' which he suffered at the battle of Nantwich while bearing arms for his sovereign.[3]

---

[1] Paul Seaward *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 196-213; John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II*, (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 160.

A maimed veteran's petition was, like the 'Answers' of defaulting accountants, and as we shall see in a later chapter, like a letter to John Walker about clerical sufferings during the wars, a narrativization of personal memory.[4] Through their petitions these old soldiers told two stories about their past, one concerning their war service, and the other about their wounding. Often these accounts were affirmed on certificates by those who believed they were a true record of the past.[5] At the centre of the second story was the veteran's own body.[6] This chapter examines the stories through which veterans interpreted their time in arms, and argues that petitioning created a particular species of public monument of the civil wars. That is, it created communities of embodied commemorations—men whose flesh was a public reminder of civil war violence, the return of the monarchy, the principles of the 'old service,' and war-induced weakness. Enduring testaments to the triumph of the royalist cause, pensioned maimed soldiers were honourable dependents that might be counted upon to encourage similar fidelity to the crown, particularly when it appeared that '41 was come again.[7]

---

[2] *An humble representation of the sad condition of many of the Kings party*…(London: 1661). 14 Car. II c. 9. 'An Act for the reliefe of poore and maimed Officers and Souldiers who have faithfully served His Majesty and His Royal Father in the late Wars,' in Great Britain, *The Statutes of the Realm: 1215-1713, Volume V* (*S.R.* v. hereafter), (London, 1963), 389-90; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, 208-10.

[3] C[hester] R[ecord] O[ffice], Q[uarter] Sessions J[udicial] F[iles] 90/3, Petition of John Wright, corporal, Michaelmas 1662; D[evon] R[ecord] O[ffice], Q[uarter] S[essions] 128/129/1, Petition of Henry Nicholls of Totnes, 1663; CRO QJF 101/2, Petition for Robert Needham of Prestbury, Trinity 1673; W[est] Y[orkshire] A[rchive] S[ervice], Q[uarter] S[essions] 1/25/4, Petition of John Moore of Sheffield, April 1686. The care of wounded soldiers during the British civil wars is explored by Barbara Donagan, 'The casualties of war: treatment of the dead and wounded in the English Civil War' in Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden (eds.) *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 114-132; her larger study of *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) appeared to late to be read. See also Eric Gruber von Arni, *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers and their Families during the English Civil War and Interregnum, 1642-1660* (Aldershot: Ashgate Press, 2001), 21-38, 42-59.

Maimed Soldiers' Petitions and Petitioning

A petition was a documented request directed to an authority by an individual or group seeking a favour or redress of a perceived grievance. Petitions have proved to be an important source for social historians seeking to discover the 'voices of the working-class and middle class,' so it is not surprising that those petitions of maimed royalist veterans featured first in works seeking to understand regional patterns of popular allegiance during the British civil wars.[8] The petitions allowed scholars to gauge which districts of a particular county, such as Somerset, Wiltshire, or Devon, had produced the most royalist soldiers. This was because the statute of 1662 providing pensions for maimed royalists required them to make their request at the Quarter Session court nearest to the place they enlisted or were pressed into arms.[9] The most noteworthy employers of this methodology have been David Underdown and Mark Stoyle, both students of early and mid seventeenth-century popular politics in the English West Country.[10] Underdown's use of the petitions (as well as his related thesis linking agrarian and social patterns with political affiliation) was criticised most notably by John Morrill and Malcolm Wanklyn, who argued that during the 1650s wounded royalist veterans might have migrated to communities which were willing to offer them charity, and that it was from these places that they petitioned for a pension after the Restoration.[11] Geoffrey Hudson used similar petitions for evidence of agency among the poor, while David Appleby has argued from the Essex petitions that war relief confirmed the ethic of neighbourliness and helped to preserve social order.[12]

---

[4] Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 147.

[5] Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson, 'Introduction: genre and narrative in life stories' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson (eds.), *Narrative and Genre* (London: Routledge, 1998), xiii.

[6] The literature on the history of the body is expanding rapidly. For introductions into the themes and problems see Mark S. R. Jenner and Bertrand O. Taithe 'The Historiographical Body' in Roger Cooter and John V. Pickstone (eds.) *Medicine in the Twentieth Century* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998), 187-200 and Roy Porter 'History of the Body Reconsidered' in Peter Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives in Historical Writing* Second edition (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 233-60.

[7] In a future study I would like to explore why 1641 was the key date for remembering the civil wars.

---

[8] Lex Heerma van Voss, 'Introduction' to Lex Heerma van Voss (ed.) *International Review of Social History: Supplement Nine: Petitions in Social History* 46 (2001), 1.

[9] 14 Car. II c. 9 [1662], *S. R. v.*, 389-90.

[10] David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), Mark Stoyle, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994), 79-82.

[11] John Morrill 'The ecology of allegiance in the English Revolution. With a reply by David Underdown' *Journal of British Studies*, 26 (1987), 451-79; Malcolm Wanklyn, 'The People go to War' *The Local Historian* 17 no. 8 (1987), 497-8.

[12] Geoffrey L. Hudson, 'Negotiating for blood money: war widows and the courts in seventeenth-century England' in Jennifer Kermode and Garthine Walker (eds.), *Women, crime and the courts in early modern England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline Press, 1994),146-74; Geoffrey Hudson 'Ex-servicemen, war widows and the English county pension scheme, 1593-1679' (Oxford: unpublished D. Phil. dissertation, 1995); for a summary of his approach to these sources see Geoffrey Hudson, 'Arguing Disability: ex-servicemen's stories in early modern England' J. Pickstone and R. Bivins (eds.) *Medicine, Madness and Social History: Essays in Honour of Roy Porter* (London: Palgrave, 2007), 105-17. David J. Appleby,

Mark Stoyle has recently demonstrated the value of maimed royalist soldiers' petitions for historians interested in how the civil wars were remembered. His analysis of the Devonshire petitions leads him to argue that post-Restoration royalist veterans had embraced a conservative and hierarchical Cavalier tradition, whose interpretation of the nation's late troubles fit their own personal memories of what the wars were about.[13] This chapter moves beyond Stoyle's work by treating the royalist veterans' stories, petitions and own persons as themselves public reminders of the troubles after 1660. It is based on a sample of 401 petitions and certificates from repositories in Devon, Cheshire, Wiltshire, West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire. The regional and chronological breakdown of the studied sample is presented in the following table:

Table I: Maimed soldiers' petitions and certificates sample by decade and region

Record Office	**1660s**	**1670s**	**1680s**	**R.O. Total**	**R.O. Percentage of Sample**
Devon	55	41	60	156	39.4
Cheshire	80	22	0	107	27.0
Wiltshire	83	2	2	87	22.0
West Yorkshire	8	24	3	35	8.8
North Yorkshire	0	0	11	11	2.8
Decade Total	226	94	76	**396**	**100**
Decade Percentage of Sample	56.4	23.4	19.0		

'Unnecessary persons? Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex, 1642-1662', *Essex Archaeology and History*, 32 (2001), 209-21.

[13] Mark Stoyle, 'Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of King Charles's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730' *History* 88 (2003), 207-26; and 'Remembering the English Civil Wars' in Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.), *The Memory of Catastrophe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 19-30.

The table includes only petitions with a known date, so five undated documents from Devon are excluded. As might be expected, the majority of the sample dates from the period closest to the war years, with the largest number from 1663 to 1665 in the immediate aftermath of the 'Act for the reliefe of poore and maimed Officers and Souldiers.'[14] Following the expiration of this legislation in 1679 some jurisdictions, such as Cheshire, stopped hearing petitions, while others such as Devon and North Yorkshire continued to accept them and to grant pensions or gratuities. A hypothesis for the rise in the number Devon petitions after 1680 will be presented below. The reason for the relative dearth of early petitions from Yorkshire's west riding is not clear; in the case of the north riding almost no Quarter Session files exist before 1685.

Wounded veterans remembered their service and injuries in a particular legal and social context. Under the county pension scheme persons seeking state compensation for injuries and disabilities sustained in combat were required to present a petition to Justices of the Peace at Quarter Session courts.[15] These judicial meetings were held across the land four times per year in January, April, July, and October.[16] During a Quarter Session court the magisterial Bench enforced the laws concerning public peace, inquired into alleged felonies and legal offences, and tried people accused of certain crimes. Local houses of correction, wage rates, and particular aspects of the poor law were also administered during these meetings.[17] Consequently, Quarter Sessions were important community gatherings, involving the local magistrates, the sheriff, the gaoler, the high constable and his bailiffs, the coroner, and the 'whole county' represented by jurors. Thus they should be understood not only as courts of law but also as 'courts of reputation,' public forums at which both rulers and ruled secured their social standing before their peers and fellow 'countrymen' largely through the performance of socially prescribed roles.[18] In other words, at Quarter Sessions both magistrates and petitioners acted and spoke their parts using conventional public scripts expressing paternal responsibility, deference, and neighbourliness.[19]

---

[14] As calculated by Hudson, 'English county pension,' 29.

[15] On the background of the county pensions see Hudson, 'English county pension,' 10-39; for the origin of the 1662 Act see Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 208-10.

[16] The names given to the quarterly meetings were Epiphany (or Hilary), Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas.

[17] For a description of the work of justices of the peace (JPs) and Quarter Sessions consult Alan G. R. Smith's *The Government of Elizabethan England* (London: Edward Arnold, 1967), 90-94. A more lengthy contemporary account is available in William Lambarde's *Eirenarcha* (London: 1599), 363-606.

Maimed soldiers' testimonies were not only shaped by the legal and social context of the court, but also by the generic properties of the document within which they were conveyed.[20] Both printed and manuscript petitions employed similar conventions, particularly the language of deference and a tripartite structure of address, premises, and prayer.[21] The deferential language within a petition highlighted the fact that it was part of a transaction between unequal parties.[22] The address identified the intended recipients of the document, as well as providing the petitioner's name, his or her hometown or parish, and occasionally his vocation. The concluding prayers of most petitions in the sample contained the petitioner's request that he or she be considered fit to receive a pension, along with a promise to pray for the addressee forever should the request be granted.[23] The middle and largest section of a petition was that of the premise, in which the petitioner 'showed' the basis of his or her request. The narratives of past service and injury were almost always contained within the premises. Petitions were thus at their heart a request drawn from a story about the past.[24]

---

[18] Richard Cust, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings' *Past and Present* no. 149 (1995), 84-8; Michael Braddick's 'Administrative performance: the representation of political authority in early modern England' in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (eds.) *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 166-187.

[19] On the significance of the 'occasion' in framing oral discourses about the past see Tonkin, *Narrating our Pasts*, 52-58; and Ulla-Maija Peltonen, 'The Return of the Narrator' in Anne Ollila (ed.) *Historical Perspectives on Memory* (Helsinki: SHS-Finnish Historical Society, 1999), 136. The importance of socially prescribed roles for the presentation of the self and constraining human interaction is theorized in the work of Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin, 1990).

[20] Petitions have received particular attention from scholars interested in mid-seventeenth century popular politics, and the complex nature of the public during the later Stuart and early Hanoverian era, see *inter alia*, Derek Hirst, 'Making Contact: Petitions and the English Republic' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), 26-50; David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); for a continental example see Andreas Würgler, 'Voices From Among the "Silent Masses": Humble Petitions and Social Conflicts in Early Modern Central Europe' *International Review of Social History: Supplement 9: petitions in social history* 46 (2001), 11-34. Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); *Representation and Misrepresentation in later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 109-162.

[21] For a fuller examination of the conventions of petitions and petitioning see David Zaret's 'Petitions and the "Invention" of Public Opinion in the English Revolution' *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (1996), 1497-555, and the essays in Lex Heerma van Voss (ed.) *International Review of Social History: Supplement Nine: Petitions in Social History* 46 (2001).

The narratives found within maimed soldiers' petitions are not unmediated creations of the men and women who submitted them to their local magistrates. Petitions were usually not written by the veteran, but by vicars, schoolmasters, former commanding officers, and court clerks; people whose social status would have given them a degree of credit with the Bench and thus added to the credibility of the veteran's story.[25] It is almost certain that the veteran's testimony was prompted by a series of interrogatories, as was the case with other court proceedings such as examinations and depositions.[26] The petitions themselves do not indicate whether a veteran's testimony was uttered before the magistrates prior to its being drawn up, or if the completed petition was read aloud before the Bench. It is appropriate nonetheless for us to consider them to be 'public' documents in that they were created in the open, and were read, if not heard, by the highest local court of law and reputation. Therefore the maimed soldiers' petitions were, like the Answers of defaulting accountants, the work of at least one voice, several pairs of ears and hands, spoken and then written according to generic linguistic conventions within a formal legal setting.[27] Nevertheless, although a royalist veteran's petition for a pension is a formulaic and multi-authored document, it was at its genesis and at its heart a story from a remembering and speaking person, who related an account about his past service and injuries for the king in the hope of securing future relief.[28] It is to the personal stories of maimed royalist soldiers conveyed within the petitions to which we will now turn.

---

[22] In her assessment of the literary significance of petitioning in later Tudor and early Stuart society, Annabel Patterson argues that by the end of the period petitions were less requests for social re-ordering by the weak and more acts of protest from people claiming their due; *Reading Between the Lines* (London: Routledge, 1993), 62-77. This appears to be confirmed by Hudson, who suggests that a number of royalist veterans used a 'language of entitlement' when petitioning for a pension, 'English county pension,' 233; c.f. van Voss, who argues that a petition may adopt the 'language of the ruling classes' in order to justify 'subaltern ways of living,' 'Introduction,' 7.

[23] Seventeenth-century English petitions, like similar documents in late Medieval and then Catholic Europe, and unlike other Protestant regimes, contained a promise from the petitioner to pray for the ruler's or magistrate's good health, Würgler, 'Petitions and Social Conflicts,' n. 24.

[24] For a similar understanding of petitions as bearing elements of the 'life stories' of supplicants see van Voss, 'Introduction,' 9.

[25] Hudson, 'English county pension,' 188. I owe the latter point to J. R. Jones.

Stories of Service

---

[26] For a reflection into the problem of 'legal narratives' as windows into early modern subjectivity see Garthine Walker, '"Just Stories: Telling Tales of Infant Death in Early Modern England' in Margaret Mikesell and Adele Seeff (eds), *Culture and Change: Attending to Early Modern Women* (London: Associated University Presses, 2003), 98-115.

[27] Drawing upon Bahktinian linguistic analysis, Garthine Walker argues that legal records are 'multi-vocal' in the sense that they contain a plurality of 'voices' or languages which can represent a variety of subject positions available to speakers, for example, the 'language of maternity' or the 'language of domesticity,' 'Just Stories,' 110-11. While Walker's insights are apposite for a reading of petitions, the main issue which she attempts to address, which is the problem of accessing early modern subjectivity, is tangential to my concerns. That is to say, we can never hope to know the ' inner memory' of a maimed soldier via his petition, but we can learn something about his public understanding of his past through his recollections of service and damaged body conveyed within these documents.

[28] Here I am drawing upon the phenomenological arguments for the connection between time and narrative in David Carr's *Time, Narrative and History*, 48-51. I am calling the accounts of the past within petitions 'narratives' instead of 'anecdotes' because the latter suggests, following Annabel Patterson's formulation, a short story which may be detached from a larger plot; see her *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 42-4. The stories of service and injury in a petition were meant to work only within the 'legal plot' supplied by the performative arena of the Quarter Sessions.

The next two portions of this chapter examine stories of service and injury within petitions. A service story was a maimed soldier's account of when, for whom, why, where and with whom, and how they fought for the cause of the king. Veterans used particular key words and phrases in their petitions in order to demonstrate that their stories and their character were true. A service story was thus crucial in identifying the petitioner as an ever-faithful royalist soldier. Taken as a whole the service stories generally evince three major temporal features: the war years, the duration of a veteran's service, and the span of time between the wars and the time of testimony. The petitioners tended to express regret or righteous anger when characterizing the civil war period. The most common term for regret was 'unhappy' which tended to avoid laying blame on Parliament for the conflict—the wars were the product of happenstance. The struggles between king and Parliament were recalled as the 'late unhappy warres here in England,' the 'late unhappy differences,' the 'late deplored wars' and even the unhappy and 'unnatural war.'[29] Three petitioners from Devonshire bemoaned the 'great distractions and divisions' which had disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the realm.[30] Other veterans used a more strident language which emphasised the Long Parliament's culpability and also the transgressive nature of the period, deploying phrases such as the 'late times of rebellion,' 'the times of rebellion and usurpation,' 'the late insurrection,' and the 'inhumain wars' waged against the king by, as one Richard Sharp labelled them, his 'blood thirsty enemies.'[31] Since the Justices, particularly during the 1660s, would have had vivid memories of the wars themselves, petitioners might have used such condemnations to stir up the Bench's Cavalier sentiments and sympathies towards an old comrade.[32]

---

[29] DRO QS 128/37, Petition for John Browne, 1664; W[iltshire] and S[windon] R[ecord] O[ffice] Q[uarter] S[essions] A1/110, Petition of Henry Dixon, yeoman, Michaelmas 1661, Petition of John Chappell, labourer, Easter 1662; DRO QS 128/85/3, Petition of John Fisher of Molland, 1660, and QS 128/45/1, Petition of Edward Mumford of Dodbrooke, 1685.

[30] DRO QS 128/96/1, Petition of Christopher Matthew, Henry Browne and Humphrey Tilliard of Ottery St Mary, 1660.

In petitions which mentioned the number of years a veteran had been in arms, a common tenure was around four years. For example, Thomas Jackson of Ashton, Cheshire was a trooper for 'four years and upwards.' A small number of veterans claimed their service lasted less than four years: in 1662 both Moses Lane and John Minshall related that they fought for 'about a year and half.' Very few men said that they had fought longer than four years. One Captain Arthur Ward declared that his service for the late king included 'all his Nine years warrs;' whether in Captain Ward's memory Charles II's invasion of England in 1651 had merged with his father's earlier struggle against Parliament must remain a mystery.[33] What is notable is the tendency to be consistent when recounting the length of their service; most veterans adhering to a space of time roughly matching the period 1642 to 1646, the period of the first civil war between Charles I and the Long Parliament. These examples therefore appear to offer evidence of members of the lower sort testifying about prominent events of their past within the chronology of the nation's history as set out in printed historical works.[34] The degree to which the prominence of recollections of four years' service in petitions was shaped by the feedback between print and oral culture must remain speculation; it is possible, for example, that veterans had heard that the wars lasted four years from an officer.

---

[31] WYAS QS 1/7/1/6, Petition of Rowland Robson of Doncaster, January 1668; CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Roger Ince, Nantwich, Trinity 1662, QJF 91/2, Petition for Ralph Burges of Mobberley, Trinity 1663; and QJF 90/3 Petition of William Hoult, Crewett, Lancs., Michaelmas 1662; WSRO A1/110, Petition of Richard Sharp, Easter 1661.
[32] I owe this point to J.R. Jones.
[33] CRO QJF 90/4, Petition of Thomas Jackson of Ashton, Epiphany 1663; WSRO A1/110, Petition for Moses Lane, Easter 1662, CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of John Minshall of Wistaston, Trinity 1662, CRO QJF 104/2, Petition of Captain Arthur Ward, Trinity 1676.
[34] Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 294-8.

Numerous petitioners emphasised that they had fought for the king from the start of the war until its unhappy end.[35] One John Cornelius served 'from the beginning unto the last period;' similarly Laurence Elliott testified that he continued 'from the beginning to the end' of the war.[36] George Honey of Cheshire declared that he had done his best to serve Charles I 'during all the time' the king had any forces in the field.[37] A Wiltshire husbandman claimed that he was in arms 'from the first occasion' that the king required his service 'to the last in Cornwall,' while a tailor from Yorkshire recalled supporting the royal cause 'from the time the king set up his standard at Nottingham until Oxford and Wallingford was yielded.'[38] While it is possible that these royalist veterans might indeed have fought for Charles I from early 1642 until mid 1646, it is more probable that they recognized the link between the duration of their service and the quality of their time in arms. Fighting 'from start to finish' meant that a petitioner's tenure as a royalist soldier had been marked by unwavering fidelity to the king. Crucially, since under the 1662 Act for the relief of maimed soldiers, only those who had never deserted the royal armies to fight for the other side could qualify for a pension, ex-soldiers had very good reasons for matching the length of their time of service for the king with the whole duration of the wars.[39] As in the Answers of defaulting accountants, personal remembering was tailored to fit chronological frameworks set by legislation.[40]

---

[35] Thomas Phillips said that he had remained in arms until the 'unhappy dissolution of His Majesty's forces;' WSRO A1/110, Petition of Thomas Phillips, tailor, Hillary 1672.

[36] DRO QS 128/10/1, Petition of John Cornelius of Bishopsteignton, 1672, and QS 128/75/2, Petition of Laurence Elliot of Lustleigh, 1684.

[37] CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of George Honey, Trinity 1661.

[38] WSRO A1/110, Petition of William Welstead, husbandman, Hilary 1662; WYAS QS 1/13/4, Petition of Chester Wilson of Reedness, April 1674.

As pensions were only to be granted to ex-soldiers who had consistently defended the cause of the monarchy, it comes as no surprise that petitioners emphasised that it was for the first King Charles that they had ventured their bodies in war.[41] Most references to Charles I in petitions usually employed descriptors such as 'of ever blessed memory,' 'of pious memory,' and 'of happy memory.'[42] This kind of commemorative language, while prosaically distinguishing the former king from his successor, also ensured that in the petitioner's narrative, and perhaps also in his memory, Charles I was not a defeated sovereign but was instead a celebrated and holy figure. It also implied that the former soldier, by retaining Charles I in his memory, was still devoted and dedicated to his cause: to remember the late king as happy, blessed, or pious, was a gesture of fidelity to him.

Veterans' service stories also used language which suggested that they had fought for matters of principle. Petitioners who testified about their rationale for taking the king's side evoked the duties of loyalty and obedience.[43] One John Edwards became a soldier 'for his love and loyaltie' to the king; similarly Henry Nicholls took up arms at the beginning of the wars 'in his loyaltie to his king and country.'[44] It was 'to express his fidelity to His Late Majesty' that John Kettle 'actually served him' during the rebellion, while the widow of George Batishill emphasized that her husband had been a 'loyall subject' and 'well affected' to the government of the 'late martyred king.'[45] Several petitioners, such as Stephen Lea and Philip Mole, explicitly noted that they had fought as royalists of their own volition: the former related that he had presented himself 'with a man and two horses completely armed' to an already serving officer, while the latter declared that he had 'enter[ed] himself' on the king's side at the beginning of the wars.[46] Among the veterans within the sample who were enlisted at least two implied that they had continued by choice. Giles Smallen of Wiltshire, for example, who remembered the name of the man who pressed him into the royalist army, also noted that he later re-listed under Captain Penruddock. And although Thomas Mortimer was 'pressed forth a souldier' for the king he claimed that he had served thereafter for eight years.[47]

---

[39] Article ii of 14 Car. II c. 9, *S R.* v, 389.
[40] Richard Stubbs declared his on-going willingness to venture 'life, limbes and liberty' for the king, CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Richard Stubbs of Congelton, Trinity 1662.
[41] CRO QJF 91/2 Petition for Ralph Burges of Mobberley, Trinity 1663, and DRO QS 128/76/1 Petition of Robert Cooke of Lydford, 1684.
[42] For example, DRO QS 128/79/1, Petition for Thomas Hooper of Marlborough, 1661, DRO QS 128/96/4, Petition of Frances Donne of Ottery St Mary, 1673, and N[orth] Y[orkshire] R[ecord] O[ffice] Q[uarter] S[essions] B[undles] 1685 f. 267, Petition of John Stonas of Stokesley, tailor, 1685.
[43] Peter Newman argued that royalist ideology was essentially an expression of the principle of loyalty; see his 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle, and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism' in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf (eds.) *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G.E. Aylmer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 225-41.
[44] WSRO A1/110, Petition of John Edwards, Easter 1662; DRO QS 128/129/, Petition of Henry Nicholls of Totnes, 1663.

Most narratives of service in a petition contain references to places where a veteran fought, which were sometime presented in the form of a list. For example, in 1661 Thomas Davis recalled being at 'several fights' which numbered at least eight, including 'Taunton, Bridgewater, Lansdowne, the Devizes Roundway, the last Newbery fight, at Cropredy bridge [and] Banbury.'[48] More than two decades later Edward Pinsent listed five sieges in the West Country—Plymouth, Exeter, Dartmouth, Barnestaple, and Biddiford—at which he had been present, while in northern Yorkshire Roland Harrison rattled off nine engagements at which he fought including Edgehill, Banbury, Cirencester, and Hessome or Marston Moor.[49] Most petitioners, however, did not present bare rolls of battles, but tended instead to link sites of combat with the names of their officers. Thus, Richard Wright remembered serving under Colonel Henry Slater at Marston Moor, William Pemberton was at Edgehill and Naseby under Thomas Cholmeley, Robert Prince served at Pontefract castle in Captain Thweng's troop in Sir Walter Vavasor's regiment, and Thomas Cowpland fought with Sir Richard Hutton 'at Wakefield, Atherton and Bradford fights.'[50] Sometime in the later 1680s the aged John Norman associated his service in northern England with Colonel Wenford and Captain Windebanke, and his experiences at Pendennis castle in Cornwall with the command of Colonel Tremaine.[51] This repeated linkage of battle sites and the names of commanders in veterans' service stories may be an example of an effort to heighten a narrative's credibility.[52] The petitioner's former officers might well have been known personally by members of the Bench, or perhaps were related to one or more Justices; by identifying his commanders the veteran would thus have been linked himself within local patronage networks.[53] Furthermore, the veteran's evocation of the elite members of the king's forces may also have worked to enhance his identification with the 'old service,' that is, with the community of honourable men who had proved their loyalty during the nation's troubles.[54]

---

[45] CRO QJF 90/4, Petition of John Kettle of Over, Epiphany 1663; DRO QS 128/101/3, Petition of Grace Batishill of Plymstock, 1662.
[46] CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Stephen Lea of Checkley, Trinity 1662; DRO QS 128/141, Petition of Philip Mole of Yealmton, 1663.
[47] WSRO A1/110, Petition for Giles Smallen, Trinity 1661, DRO QS 128/86, Petition for Thomas Mortimer of Morchard Bishop, husbandman, 1672.
[48] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Thomas Davis, Michaelmas 1661.

---

[49] DRO QS 128/17/2, Petition of Edward Pinsent of Bridford, 1683; NYRO QSB 1685 f. 259, Petition of Roland Harrison of Whitby.

[50] CRO QJF 90/4, Petition of Richard Wright of Rostherne Epiphany 1663; CRO QJF 91/2 Petition for William Pemberton, Trinity 1663; WYAS QS 1/11/7, Petition for Robert Prince of Barwick in Elmett, October 1672; WYAS QS 1/14/6, Petition of Thomas Cowpland of Barwick in Elmett, July 1675.

[51] DRO QS 128/121/17, Petition of John Norman of Tavistock, n.d.

[52] As Natalie Davis argues was the case with the details included in the 'pardon tales' within French letters of remission; *Fiction in the Archives*, 44-7.

[53] This is another point I owe to J. R. Jones. A good deal of scholarship on local patronage networks in early modern England concerns the later medieval period, for example; A.J. Pollard, *North-Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War and Politics, 1450-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); Christine Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); I owe these references to Nadine Lewycky. Much of the first wave of revisionist historiography about the origins of the civil wars derived from studies of politics at the county level; J.S. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).

When a maimed soldier's petition related how he had served the king during the wars it almost always did so in a language of fidelity, one of the key constituents of early modern conceptions of honour.[55] Many ex-soldiers emphasized that they had evinced constant loyalty to Charles I during the conflict with phrases such as 'very faithfully,' 'never on the other side,' 'ever faithful and loyal,' and 'never deserted His Majesty's service.'[56] John Stonas had never sided with 'the Rebells although [he was] often thereunto solicited.[57] Three veterans from Maglefield in Cheshire declared themselves 'true soldiers without mutation,' while Richard Morgan of Audley, Staffordshire claimed that he had 'demayned himself truly loyal and faithful' in his service to the king.[58] Similarly, Thomas Massey recalled that 'never at any time' had he revolted, but diligently obeyed his orders, 'faithfully and honestly' discharging the trust placed in him, and had always 'demeaned himself civilly to all persons.'[59] In all his many engagements, services and hardships during the wars John Taylor had 'constantly manifest[ed] his loyalty and allegiance to the utmost of his power and capacity.'[60] The widow Elizabeth Akinson remembered that her husband had always 'manfully fought' for the king 'as longe as he had life.'[61] A number of petitioners also highlighted their constancy to the royal cause even after their time in arms. In 1662 one Thomas Parker noted his faithfulness and loyalty 'in service and since;' Berkenhead Beverley declared in 1676 that he 'hath bin and was' a true and faithful soldier, and was 'still continuing his loyalty and allegiance' to the present king; and four years later John Marchant recalled that he had served 'with all alacrity and true fidelity as a trooper' and that he 'still remains a faithful loyal subject.'[62] The language of fidelity in petitions suggests that these relatively humble men understood their honour derived from faithful service to the king in battle. Royalist honour for these ex-soldiers was thus a kind of blending of chivalric and humanist emphases, in which 'honour in virtue and service' was substantiated by 'honour in blood and battle.'[63]

---

[54] On the linkage between the phrase 'the old service' and royalist conceptions of loyalty see Newman, 'The King's Servants,' 227.

[55] Mervyn James, 'English politics and the concept of honour, 1485-1642' in his *Society, Politics and Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 413. There has been considerable work on honour in early modern Britain since James's pioneering study, much of it focused on the relationships between honour, gender, and patriarchy, for example, Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England: 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 101-5; Faramerz Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1996), 201-213; Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*, (London: Longman, 1999), 7-9; Katharine W. Swett, '"The Account Between Us": Honor, Reciprocity and Companionship in Male Friendship in the Later Seventeenth Century' *Albion* 31 (1999), 1-30; and Linda Pollock, 'Honor, Gender and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570-1700,' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 3-29. A brief introduction to the meaning of honour in early modern English culture, which moves beyond the honour/gender binary is R. M. Smuts, *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685* (London: Macmillian, 1999), 8-17.

[56] The examples are taken from the petitions of David Slugg and Thomas Carpenter of Wiltshire, WSRO A1/110, Hillary 1661; Philip Mole of Yealmton in Devonshire, DRO QS 128/141, 1663, and Nicholas Kift of Wiltshire, WSRO A1/110, Michaelmas 1666.

[57] NYRO QSB 1685 f. 267, Petition of John Stonas of Stokesley, tailor.

[58] CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of Henry Bennet; James Mosson; John Redfern of Maglefield, Trinity 1661; CRO QJF Petition for Richard Morgan of Audley, Staffordshire, Trinity 1663.

The purpose of service stories was to demonstrate that maimed soldiers were completely loyal to the king during and since the wars. This suggests that veterans and those who received their accounts believed that a 'true' narrative of royalist civil war service was one which was both faithful to what had really happened in the past—as the references to particular battles and officers' names suggests—and which also demonstrated its subject's honour, his faithfulness to the king's community of loyal defenders.[64] The language of fidelity thus presented him as constantly 'true' to his sovereign, and so an honourable man with an honourable past. No doubt there were ex-soldiers who narrated their account of service to the old king in the language of honour in order to give both themselves and their stories credit within the court of reputation which was their local Quarter Sessions, thereby boosting their chances of securing a pension. It is possible that there were petitioners who told a story of constant loyalty whose actual wartime service was marked as much by attempts to flee danger as by continually venturing life and limb for the king.[65] In such cases the veteran's neighbours, or the Bench itself, might have seen through the dubious tale.[66] As we shall see below, it was often not enough for a veteran to testify to his past loyalty alone.

---

[59] WYAS QS 1/8/5, Petition of Thomas Massey of Adwick, July 1669.
[60] DRO QS 128/117/1, Petition of John Taylor of Spreyton, 1684.
[61] CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of Elizabeth Akinson of Namptwich [Nantwich], Trinity 1661.
[62] CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Thomas Parker of Alpraham, Trinity 1662; CRO QJF 103/4, Petition of Berkenhead Benerley of Huntingdon, Epiphany 1676; DRO QS 128/111, Petition of John Marchant of Sheldon, husbandman, 1680.
[63] James, 'English politics and the concept of honour,' 413.

It is also possible, however, that the rhetoric of fidelity served as a public script which veterans willingly adopted to make sense of their individual experience of the wars, particularly their wounds and suffering. Oral historians who have worked on memories of First World War veterans have suggested that they composed their recollections of war service using public languages, for example, the 'ANZAC legend,' and that they narrated these recollections both to themselves and others in ways that enabled them to come to terms with both their past and their present situation.[67] It would be good to know, for example, if civil war veterans' stories changed over time, particularly as the meaning of honour within English political culture developed.[68] Unfortunately the brevity of royalists' soldiers' petitions do not give us the same kind of insights into their memories, or even unconscious struggles, as do oral interviews and memoirs of Great War veterans.[69] Notwithstanding the conventional, and indeed formal, nature of expressions of constant loyalty within petitions, it is important to be open to the possibility that their accounts of honourable service were not simply instrumental narratives constructed with a pension in view, or even a recasting of past experience motivated by a psychic need to repress memories of disloyalty or flight, but rather a story which conveyed the petitioner's interpretation of when, for whom, why, where, and how they fought for the cause of the king during the civil wars.[70] Without such a powerful explanatory narrative, in which a soldier's past military service was a concrete application of the principle of loyalty, it might have been very difficult for veterans to make sense of their maimed

---

[64] The idea that civil war royalists constituted the community of the loyal, at least for those who left printed evidence of their views, is suggested by G. E. Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid-Seventeenth Century England: II. Royalist Attitudes' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Soceity, Fifth Series* 37 (1987), 29; Jerome De Groote emphasizes the importance of 'Order' to royalist sensibility during the 1640s in his *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), 5.

[65] Charles Carlton notes the importance of 'panic fear' in the disintegration of fighting units during a rout in his 'The Impact of Fighting' in John Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), 26-9.

[66] I owe this suggestion to J. R. Jones.

[67] Alistair Thomson, *ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 8-9. For a similar argument about the importance of a national 'myth' of war to veterans' remembering,

---

based on archival and literary sources in Canada, see Jonathan F. W. Vance, *Death so noble: memory, meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997). The importance of narratives drawn from war-time experiences for the composition of modern masculine selves able to make sense of time is highlighted by Graham Dawson in *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 1994), 22-3.

[68] Although James's thesis that English conceptions of honour shifted during the early modern period from a chivalric notion of 'honour in blood and battle' to a more modern understanding of 'honour in virtue and service' has been disputed for neglecting the continuing importance of both concepts into the seventeenth century, the meaning of honour was far from stable after 1660; for a critique of James see Cust 'Honour and Politics,' 74, and Markku Peltonen, '"Civilized with death": Civility, Duelling and Honour in Elizabethan England' in Jennifer Richards (ed.), *Early Modern Civil Discourses* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003) 51-67. On the problem of honour in a political culture contorted by the dangers of deception see John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 110-18.

[69] Using Freud's theory of war neuroses, Michael Roper has explored how former soldiers used public scripts of valour to overcome their traumatic memories of combat; 'Re-remembering the Soldier Hero: the Psychic and Social Construction of Memory in Personal Narratives of the Great War' *History Workshop Journal* 50 (2000), 181-204. Roper's case study is based on the written recollections of the same man produced during the First World War, in the 1950s, and the early 1970s.

[70] Here I am clearly in agreement with Stoyle's argument about the petitions serving as evidence for popular royalism in his 'Memories of the Maimed.'

bodies, and to accept the personal sacrifices required by the 'old service.'[71] It is to the narratives which related the origin of their injuries to which we must now turn.

Stories of Maiming

While a service story was crucial in identifying the petitioner as a true royalist soldier, an injury story was an account which related his former action on behalf of the king to his current disability. Veterans related the origin of their wounds with varying degrees of detail, and emphasised different aspects of the moment of injury. In the analysis which follows I have chosen to classify injury stories according to their most prominent elements: the corporeal, the ablative, the temporal-locative, and the corporeal-locative. These elements may be understood to represent or 'stand for' a component of the veteran's memory of his injuring, including the feeling of pain.[72] From this it is possible to suggest that a maimed soldier's injury story made present the civil war past, and became a kind of commemoration of his fidelity; a royalist veteran's war wound thus became an embodied sign of loyalty.[73]

The sparsest injury accounts contain only a corporeal element, relating that the ex-soldier's body was wounded while serving the king. It was 'in the late unhappy wars' that David Merrill was maimed and Christopher Amber suffered 'many wounds,' and it was while serving 'our gracious King Charles' at 'many fights' that John White had sustained numerous injuries.[74] A yeoman from Wiltshire, Robert Davies, had incurred a number of injuries on 'his head face body armes and hands;' his head had never 'fully recovered' and one of his arms was 'made useless.'[75] During his time as a soldier Samuel Andrew 'first lost the use of one of his hands;' later while fighting for the king he suffered the worse 'misfortune' to be blinded in both eyes.[76] What is significant about such minimalist injury stories is the fact that they highlight the petitioner's maimed body, which acted like a kind of memorial to, or even 'archive' of, his time with the king's forces during the troubles. The wounds which 'did much to disenable [the] body' of Robert Mainwaringe were received during his 'faithful and loyal service.'[77]

---

[71] One purpose of exemplary narratives, according to Jörn Rüsen, is to relate particular past events to 'regularities of what happened and should happen,' *History*, 12. Thus particular past actions, such as a husbandman fighting for Charles I during the 1640s could substantiate for him and his audience the universal validity of the principle of loyalty.

[72] See Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, 147, on the idea that memory and history possess an iconic or representational quality, both of them 'standing for' an absent time. Much of my analysis is indebted to Elaine Scarry's *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 62-152.

[73] Much like circumcision serves to remind a Jewish man of who he is in relation to God and to other men, or a stigma recalls Christ's passion on the body of a Christian saint; on the body as an archive see Jacques Derrida in *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Translated by E. Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 26.

That war wounds were perceived to be a material witness of past loyal service can be inferred from the petitions which indicate that ex-royalist soldiers showed, or were willing to show, their wounds to the Bench.[78] For example, George Yearsley would 'shew unto your worships' the wounds which prevented him from labouring, and Jasper Winworth would make appear to the magistrates 'the signal markes on his flesh and bones,' particularly his disabled right hand and left arm.[79] The dangerous wounds Thomas Massey sustained at Wakefield and York still appeared 'upon his Body,' while the hurts, shots, and wounds suffered by James Harvey and Thomas Brewer were 'yet visible' in 1678 and 1682 respectively.[80] The maimed soldier could also submit certificates from other people who believed his story from having seen his broken body. The certifiers of a husbandman from Dartmouth, John Pound, had 'viewed the wound,' and likewise one Abraham Guy declared on his certificate for John Ball that he had 'seen his hurts.'[81] William Smith, a surgeon, submitted a certificate for Captain William Bluett on which he noted that the captain 'hath exposed his body to be searched which I find hath been wounded in diverse places.'[82] There is some evidence that magistrates were themselves also interested in seeing the injury: the Cheshire magistrates granted a pension to Roger Ince after hearing his presentation 'and view[ing] his wounds.' [83] While some of this showing and telling was no doubt an attempt to demonstrate that the petitioner was truly injured, it is evident from these examples that a veteran's damaged body could be revealed, and examined, as a way of confirming that his service and injury stories were true.

---

[74] DRO QS 128/143/1, Petition of David Merrill, 1661, WYAS QS 1/24/6, Petition of Christopher Ambler of Winmoore, July 1685, DRO QS 128/1/4, Petition of John White of Alphingston, carpenter, 1675.
[75] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Robert Davies, yeoman, Easter 1661.
[76] WYAS QS 1/13/4, Petition of Samuel Andrew of Gargreave, April 1674.
[77] CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Robert Mainwaringe of Shavington, Trinity 1662.
[78] Hudson argues from his research that JPs increasingly expected soldiers to reveal their wounds as part of their application for a pension, 'English county pension,' 339.
[79] CRO QJF 90/4, Petition of George Yearsley, Epiphany 1663, WSRO A1/110, Petition of Jasper Wintworth, Trinity 1661.

There were numerous stories which related only the temporal and locative element of their injury. John Commin had suffered a 'desperate wound at Church Hanney, Berkshire.' Similarly, Richard Purslake received an injury fighting at Lyme that put him to 'much misery and torment,' while it was 'against Bradford' that Thomas Morris's body took 'many hurts and wounds.'[84] It was at York where Randle Briscoe was maimed, and 'at the battle of Naseby' where Edward Vaughan was 'unfortunately wounded.'[85] By contrast, a few petitioners chose only to relate the ablative element of their wounding; Henry Nash had been 'wounded by a shot,' Nicholas Bennett was 'very much disabled' by 'a shott received,' and while in service Richard Jones had 'received several shots and wounds in his bodie.'[86] The elderly Robert Chapel told how his several disabling wounds were caused 'by musquet and sword.'[87] A recollection of the means of injuring was closely linked to a remembrance of how it felt, both then and now, to be wounded.[88]

---

[80] WYAS QS 1/8/5, Petition of Thomas Massey of Adwick, July 1669, DRO QS 128/107/1, Petition of James Harvey of Samford Courtenay, 1678, and DRO 128/28/2, Petition of Thomas Brewer of Chagford, 1682.

[81] DRO 128/42/1, Certificate for John Pound of Dartmouth, 1661, WSRO A1/110, Certificate for John Ball from the borough of Malmesbury, Easter 1669.

[82] DRO QS 128/103/1, Certificate for William Blewett of Plymtree, 1671.

[83] CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Roger Ince of Natwich, Trinity 1662. Robert Collier's certifiers declared that they had 'examined the ability' of the petitioner, finding him 'much weakened in his body for the performance of his calling;' WSRO A1/110, Certificate for Robert Collier, Epiphany 1660.

[84] WSRO A1/110, Petition of John Commin, Michaelmas 1661, WYAS QS 1/13/4, Petition of Thomas Morris, April 1674, DRO QS 128/88, Petition of Richard Purselake of Netherexe, 1660.

A portion of injury stories contained both temporal-locative and ablative elements. For example, one veteran who travelled from Oxfordshire in early 1663 to petition before Cheshire JPs told them that he was 'blowne upp with powder at Edgehill.' Similarly, William Batishill remembered that during the storming and taking of Great Torrington 'and the Church blown up by gun power' he was 'much scalded and hurted.'[89] The petitioner John Paterson related that it was at Worcester 'where [he was] shot through the body with a musket bullet,' while Robert Render, with some ambiguity, claimed that he had received 'several wounds by shot and otherwise' when fighting 'at Hull and likewise at several other places.'[90] Other petitioners related the temporal-locative and corporeal-locative elements of their wounds. During the siege of Taunton William Russell had 'utterly lost the use of one of his arms;' similarly Richard Stubbs lost his left arm 'in that fatal battle of Marston Moor,' and 'at Alsford fight' William Greet sustained injuries 'in his leg and belly.'[91] In Isaac Dyer's story 'his right legge' was 'wounded at Newberry fight.'[92] Chester Wilson claimed that he was wounded several times in the king's service but specifically related the loss of one eye to action during 'the relieving of Reeding;' his fellow Yorkshireman Martin Hague, however, did not specify at which of the five battles he listed 'he [had] received divers wounds in his hands, head, and body.'[93]

---

[85] CRO QJF 104/1, Petition of Randle Briscow of Leftwich, a Webster, Easter 1676, WSRO A1/110, Petition of Edward Vaughan, Easter 1662.

[86] WSRO A1/110 Petition of Henry Nash, Michaelmas 1666: Michaelmas, Petition of Henry Nash, DRO QS 128/135, Petition of Captain Nicholas Bennet of Widecombe, 1669, and CRO QJF 103/4, Petition for Richard Jones of Pulford, Epiphany 1676.

[87] DRO QS 128/13/14, Petition of Robert Chapel of Bradningh, 1686.

[88] Hudson suggests that veterans may have cited gun and cutting injuries because a serious sword wound could imply that he had fled from a fight, 'English county pension,' 355-6. Even if this was indeed the case for some petitions it does not affect my point about the ablative component of an injury story standing for the absent maiming and pain-inflicting weapon.

[89] CRO QJF 90/4, Petition of William Hassell of St Mary Magdelen parish in Oxfordshire, Epiphany 1663; DRO QS 128/124, Petition of William Batishill of Throwleigh, 1683. Diane Purkiss argues from a reading of printed accounts of civil war battles that the disorder caused by gunpowder was a particular threat to a soldier's sense of order, see her *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 38. The maimed soldiers' petitions suggest that veterans perceived the damage to their bodies suffered in combat as taking away their ability to fulfill their duty as men to provide for their wives and children.

A number of veteran's injury stories centred on the means of his wounding and where on his body it occurred. After having parts of skull removed William Booth also took a shot in a shoulder, received a cut in a leg, and was 'run into the breast with a pike.' His fellow county-man Robert Needham by comparison suffered mildly, being 'maymed in his right hand by a shott.'[94] Among the 'hurts and hardships' which were recounted by James Woodman were 'two shots, one in his shoulder and the other in his belly,' along with two cuts in his head.[95] In the case of Laurence Meas it was his own weapon that had disabled him, for 'by the recoyle of his musket had his shoulder [been] so shattered' that his arm was ruined.[96] Sometimes the remembered means of injury was not a weapon of war but one of its environmental hazards, such as spending long periods of time outdoors. One William Hoult suffered 'great aches and pains in his limbes and joints' from having 'got into his body an extreme cold by lying in the open field in the extreme weather.' Similarly, the aches and pains in Philip Luckman's limbs which had disabled him were 'occasioned by cold watchings and hard travel.'[97]

---

[90] CRO QJF 89/4, Petition of John Paterson of Altringham, Epiphany 1662, NYAS QS 1685, f. 265, Petition of Robert Render of Raskelf, October 1685.
[91] WSRO A1/110, Petition of William Russell, labourer, Trinity 1661, CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Richard Stubbs of Congleton, Trinity 1662, WSRO A1/110, Petition of William Greet, Easter 1662.
[92] DRO QS 128/143/4, Petition of Isaac Dyer of St Thomas [?], 1666.
[93] WYAS QS 1/13/4, Petition of Chester Wilson of Reedness, April 1674, and QS 1/14/5, Petition of Martin Hague of Barwick in Elmet, July 1675. He recalled fighting at Atherton, Bradford, Burlington Key, Rotherham and Tadcaster.
[94] CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of William Booth, Trinity 1661, and QJF 101/2, Petition of Robert Needham of Prestbury, Trinity 1673.
[95] DRO QS 128/94/3, Petition of James Woodman of Okehampton, n.d.

The most detailed injury narratives within the sample petitions related the temporal-locative, corporeal-locative, and ablative aspects of the veteran's injury. For example, 'in a skirmish against Sir William Brereton at Namptwich' Thomas Dutton took a shot in his thigh.[98] Similarly, it was after 'many and dangerous assaults' during the siege of Taunton that Griffin Morgan 'was thrust through with a bullet in his thigh' and also 'shot through the other thigh with a bullet,' and likewise Richard Head recalled taking a shot 'from the throat through [to] the right shoulder' at the same battle.[99] The sword wounds to the head sustained by Edward Bagshaw at York not only meant that 'nine bones [were] taken out of his skull' but also that for three weeks 'he eated att a hole in the side of his head.'[100] And included among the 'seven several wounds' which Rowland Humphrey received in the king's service were a sword cut to the head and bullet in the hand at Newbury, a cut in the hand and 'a great blow with a musket' at the taking of Bristol, and the 'cutting of his lips' during the siege of Reading.[101] Since these accounts were all made within ten years of the Restoration, their higher degree of detail was perhaps related to the relative freshness of the memory of injury in the veteran's mind.

---

[96] CRO QJF 89/3, Petition of Laurence Meas, Michaelmas 1661.

[97] CRO QJF 90/3, Petition of William Hoult of Crewett, Lancs., Michaelmas 1662, and DRO QS128/125, Petition of Philip Luckman of Thurlestone, 1683. The non combat-related hazards of civil war soldier's experience are discussed in Charles Carlton, *Going to the Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars* (London: Routlege, 1992), 90-115. Hudson argues that ex-soldiers who mentioned the harmful long-term effects of cold on their bodies were evincing an awareness of the 'humoral theory' of the body, 'English county pension,' 352.

[98] CRO QJF 90/3, Petition of Thomas Dutton, Aston iuxta Mondrum, Michaelmas 1662.

[99] DRO QS 128/85/3, Petition of Griffin Morgan of Molland, 1664, and WSRO Petition of Richard Head, Michaelmas 1660.

[100] WYAS QS 1/8/3/6, Petition of Edward Bagshaw of Guisborough, April 1669.

A few petitioners related on-going pain as contemporary proof of their injury and disability. In the case of Richard Salmon of Cheshire, he stated that he could not get out of bed independently since sustaining a 'blow with the butt end of a musket upon his hipp-bone.'[102] In 1669 William Crofts claimed that he had been 'reduced to very great straights' from a recent illness and the 'pain occasioned by his wounds.'[103] A small number of veterans declared that they recalled the moment of injury through pain brought about by environmental factors. John Paterson claimed that at every change of weather he was troubled 'with paine arising from his former hurts.'[104] Others blamed their advancing years for the heightening pain from their civil war wounds. The shots in the shoulder and belly and cuts to the head incurred by James Woodman during the wars were 'now in his old age…more painful and grevious than formerly.' In 1676 Owed Dod, having 'grown into years,' claimed that he frequently endured 'remembrances of his hard service' due to the 'aches and paines…occasioned by the late unhappy warrs.'[105] Unlike a scar, a limp, or a missing limb, pain could not be seen or demonstrated to the Bench.[106] It is not clear what petitioners who mentioned the pain hoped to achieve with their auditors. Possibly for them pain was an additional narrative detail to enhance their credibility, or simply another motif within the language of deference by which a veteran sought to make himself sympathetic. Whatever the reason for explicitly bringing up pain in a petition, it need not be discounted too quickly as merely a convention in his quest for a pension.[107] If it is true that bodies retain knowledge gained in the past—for example, habits of posture--pain may indeed have been a corporeal reminder for many veterans of their injury and civil war service, the body's way of bringing into the present the moment of wounding.[108]

---

[101] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Rowland Humphrey, yeoman, Easter 1661.
[102] CRO QJF 90/3, Petition of Richard Salmon of Nantwich, Michaelmas 1662.
[103] WYAS QS 1/8/3/6, Petition of William Crofts of Darfield, April 1669.
[104] CRO QJF 89/4, Petition of John Paterson of Altringham, Epiphany 1662, and also John Wright, whose wounds 'very much trouble him at change and fall and liekwayes at change of weather so that [he] is and sore troubled;' CRO QJF 90/3, Michaelmas 1662.
[105] DRO QS 128/94/3, Petition of James Woodman of Okehampton, n.d., and CRO QJF 104/1, Petition for Owen Dod of Beeston, Easter 1676.
[106] As Scarry argues, to feel pain is to have certainty, while to hear that someone else is in pain is to be doubtful; *Body in Pain*, 7.

Maimed royalist soldiers remembering and testifying about the origin of their injuries employed a combination of corporeal, ablative, temporal-locative, and corporeal-locative elements. These accounts based on veteran's memories made present, in a mediated fashion, the civil wars' central activity of injuring and killing in the public domain.[109] Furthermore, once the story of injury was written into a petition it became part of the public record of the troubles. Therefore, a veteran's injury story may be understood as a species of early modern commemoration, for like the funeral monuments in churches throughout the land, the maimed soldiers' testimony and petitions reiterated and represented his civil war experience in the present.[110] In other words, the process by which ex-soldiers petitioned was a public reminder of the late troubles, a way of keeping part of the memory of the civil wars alive. In particular, these stories and petitions kept alive the memory of sacrifices for the sake of loyalty, and so complemented the annual reminders of 30 January fast day sermons of the regicides' unprecedented perfidy.[111] The commemorative implications of the petitioners and their narratives within post-Restoration English culture will be explored as part of this chapter's concluding reflections, but prior to that we must examine briefly the two ways by which maimed soldiers connected their civil war service and injury to a potential pensioned future: the rhetoric of disability and use of certifiers and certificates.

---

[107] Classical and medieval memory schemes emphasised the sensory and emotional composition of 'memory images.' Mary J. Carruthers points out that Aristotle and Averroes argued that 'the one who recollects will experience the same pleasure or pain in this situation which he would experience were the thing existing in actuality,' *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 54-60.

[108] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 72. The reformation of table manners among the European nobility as part of the early modern 'civilizing process' was arguably an effort to impart new knowledge and remembering into the hands and bodies of gentlemen; see in particular E. Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17-46, and Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 82-7.

[109] On the metonymic transference of the absent past into the present see Eelco Runia's 'Presence' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 27-9, and F. R. Ankersmit, '"Presence" and Myth' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 317-27. For a reminder that this occurs indirectly I must thank Gary Rivett.

[110] There is increasing interest in the written preservation of oral traditions and customary rights via litigation procedures during the period, as explored in Adam Fox's *Oral and Literate Culture in England:*

Present Disability

This section briefly explores the rhetorical connections within petitions between a veteran's past injury, present disability, and potentially pensioned future. A petition was a public explanation of the veteran's present poverty-inducing disability.[112] The rhetoric of disability within petitions connected a veteran's current low material and physical condition to an existing bodily impairment, which had been caused by his civil war

---

1500-1700 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 259-97, and Andy Wood's *The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country, 1520-1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 138, 150-58, and also on the importance of funeral monuments within churches, as in Nigel Llewellyn's 'Honour in Life, Death and in the Memory: Funeral Monuments in Early Modern England' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1996), 179-200, and Peter Sherlock's 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 263-89. For a survey of the 'ways of remembering' during the period see Woolf, *The Social Circulation*, 268-298.

[111] Lois Potter, 'The royal martyr in the Restoration: national grief and national sin' in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Royallimage: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1999), 240-62.

[112] Under the 1662 'Act for the relief of poor and maimed soldiers' veterans were considered disabled if they could not work (14 Car II, c. 9 article ii, *S. R.* v, 389), which supports Roger Cooter's argument that early modern 'able-bodiness' was determined by one's capacity to be employed; 'The Disabled Body' in R. Cooter and J. V. Pickstone (eds.), *Medicine in the Twentieth Century* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 2000), 369-70.

service and injury, and which was preventing him from earning his own livelihood. For example, a tailor from Wiltshire, Thomas Edwards, declared that the many wounds he received at Marston Moor occasioned 'much imperfection in [his] body,' particularly in his left arm, which had 'disabled him.' John Bickerson asserted that because of 'those shots and hurts' received in the king's service he could not follow his trade as a shoemaker. Similarly, John Browne of Cornwood in Devonshire was rendered 'altogether unable to labour for to get himself a livelihood' as a consequence of the several wounds suffered during the wars.[113] Sometimes a veteran would also emphasize that his present disability and consequent poverty were causing hardships for his dependents. For example, Ralph Burges had been so maimed 'in diverse parts of his bodie' that he was 'utterlie disabled in following any calling' towards the subsistence of himself, his wife and six small children. Similarly, Rowland Robson had 'several wounds' in the king's service which had 'totally disabled him' from getting a living for his wife and family.[114] Even a few later petitioners connected a present inability to work to their old wounds. In 1683 John Churchward claimed that since the end of the wars he had 'honestly endeavoured the getting of his living,' but that 'by reason of these wounds is now disabled.' Two years later Matthew Winter, who recalled being 'att many fights' for the king during the wars, declared that because of the wounds received therein 'he is disabled from working.'[115] There was less shame in being presently disabled and poor if the cause of a man's current low estate was an injury incurred during honourable service for the king.[116]

---

[113] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Thomas Edwards, tailor, Michaelmas 1661; CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of John Bickerson of Wrenbury, Trinity 1661; DRO QS 128/37, Petition for John Browne of Cornwood, 1664.
[114] CRO QJF 91/2, Petition for Ralph Burges of Mobberley, Trinity 1663, and WYAS QS 1/7/1/6, Petition of Rowland Robson of Doncaster, January 1668.
[115] DRO QS 128/119/2, Petition of John Churchward of Stoke Gabriel, 1683; and NYRO QSB 1685 f. 263, Petition of Matthew Winter of Skipton.

Petitioners might also attribute their current disability to the combined effects of their past injury and present old age. In 1660 John Hillman, his left hand maimed during his service of Charles I, claimed that he 'now is grown aged and a very poor man…and not able to work.' William Greet stated two years later that he was 'grown poor and aged and disabled' from the hardships of his civil war service. Similarly, in the spring of 1669 in Yorkshire Edward Bagshaw underscored that 'now by reason of his age and said wounds [he] is very poor and unable to acquire maintenance for himself and children.'[117] In the late 1670s and early 1680s more petitioners emphasised the age of the wounds which were compounding the disabling consequences of long life. For example, Richard Sprat contended that 'being now grown auncient' his 'auncient hurts doe so debilitate him as that he is not able to follow his imployment.' And William Metcalfe, who recalled that, since leaving the king's service, he had 'endeavoured by all honest waies to get a livelihood,' nonetheless noted that 'hee is now by his old wounds utterly disabled to help himself.'[118] The stress on the age of a petitioner's wounds perhaps reflected his desire to establish better a firm connection between his present disability and participation in the 'old service' during the civil wars. For, if the veteran's auditors did not believe that his present inability to work and earn a living 'dated' from an injury sustained fighting for Charles I, he stood little chance of enjoying a pensioned future. The perception in early modern communities that many 'disenabled' people were in fact healthy frauds meant that many old soldiers did not petition for a pension by themselves but with the support of people who believed their stories of service and injury.[119]

---

[116] I owe this point to Nadine Lewycky. The connection between civil war injuries and manhood will be explored below.

[117] DRO QS 128/121/1, Petition of John Hillman of Tavistock, 1660, WSRO A1/110, Petition for William Greet, Easter 1662, and WYAS QS 1/8/3/6, Petition of Edward Bagshaw of Guisborough, April 1669.

[118] DRO QS 128/56/4, Petition of Richard Sprat of Exeter St Thomas, 1679, and NYRO QSB 1686 f. 118, Petition of William Metcalfe, senior, of Yarm.

Documents against Disbelief: Certificates and Collective Remembering

The Act of 1662 for relief of maimed soldiers stipulated that petitioners were to present the Justices with a 'Certificate of [their] service and hurts' from their captain or another commissioned officer. A proviso was made where such officers were dead to allow relief to be granted based on the testimony and certificate of 'persons of credit.'[120] Certificates recorded the bearers' belief that the premises of a petition were true; they were, as their name implies, statements adding to the credit of the petitioner's testimony.[121] They exemplify what Maurice Halbwachs called the 'social frameworks' of remembering, the fact that groups bear and sustain images of the past through time.[122] Stoyle's argument about the post-Restoration cooperation of royalist soldiers and officers, which is indicated by the certificates, suggests that the community of old Cavaliers constituted one such social framework of civil war memories.[123] It is also possible to interpret certificates as instances of common and shared memories of exemplary royalism percolating in local communities for years after the civil wars.

---

[119] Cooter, 'Disabled Body,' 369.

[120] Article ii of 14 Car. II c. 9, *S R.* v.,389.

[121] Steven Shapin, *The Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); but cf. R. W. Serjeantson, 'Testimony and Proof in Early-Modern England', *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, 30 (1999), 195-236.

[122] Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38-40.

[123] Stoyle, 'Memories of the Maimed', 224-5.

Common memory is direct knowledge about the past available to individuals who live through certain experiences together and then recall them from personal memory. Shared memories are indirect and mediated knowledge about the past. [124] For example, the combatants at the battle of Edgehill in October 1642, such as John Wright of Cheshire, would have possessed similar but not necessarily identical first-hand recollections of that event which non-participants (both contemporary and future) did not.[125] Non-combatants would have learned about Edgehill and thereafter remembered it owing to various descriptive media, such as oral testimonies and printed accounts.[126] As more time passed, non-participants learned about Edgehill from histories of the civil wars that were themselves reliant in part on earlier reports, oral, written, and printed. Thus common memories of a past event were the property of the few 'who were there,' while everyone else who knew about and remembered it did so through shared memories.

Certificates testified to a communal belief, based on common or shared memories, in the truth of an ex-soldier's story about his past. Common memories of a veteran's injury were derived from the community of fellow combatants, both officers and soldiers. In 1662 one of William Welstead's former officers assured the Justices that Welstead had indeed served in his troop and been shot 'with a brace of bullett in the thye'. Similarly during the following year, Vivian Leigh certified that William Yates had fought under him and lost the use of his hand when he was taken prisoner at Brampton.[127] Two decades later Captain Bartholomew Gidley's certificate suggested varying degrees of certainty within his memory about James Potter's past; while he knew that Potter fought with him for several years, he believed the petitioner had been wounded in the king's service.[128] Gidley might well have remembered Potter's service under him during the wars but only heard from others about the veteran's being wounded.

---

[124] Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 51-2

[125] Wright claimed on his petitions to have piece of a bullet fired during that battle still in his arms, see above note 2.

[126] The fact that participants report the same event differently is illustrated by the two contrasting accounts of Edgehill, the royalist *His Majesties declaration to all his loving subjects after his late victory against the rebels on Sunday the 23 of October*...(Oxford, 1642) and the Parliamentarian *A most true and exact relation of both the battels fought by his Excellency and his forces against the bloudy cavelliers*...(London: 1642).

Maimed soldiers' certificates also indicate that a community's shared memories were a significant source of knowledge about a veteran's past.[129] Thomas Ezard's neighbours were relatively precise when certifying that they 'well remembered' his listing in Lord Garnet's regiment 'in the year of our Lord 1643 or 1644.' In the spring of 1674 six residents of Longpreston in western Yorkshire declared that Richard Maudsley's disabled right arm derived from a wound suffered fighting for the king. Seven years later Robert Spray managed to get sixteen men, including the rector, two constables, two wardens, and two overseers of the poor, to put their hands to a certificate acknowledging his petition was true.[130] Certificates were sometime derived from the common memories of fellow combatants and the shared memories of neighbours. A yeoman from Wiltshire, Henry Dixon, attached a certificate in October 1661 to his petition, originally submitted to the Marquis of Hertford, which assured its readers that everything mentioned therein was 'most true and notoriously known' in the surrounding country; it was signed by the earl of Berkshire and thirty-one other men. In the same year just under thirty hands signed and certified brothers John and George Bickerton of Wrenbury's petition, including at least fourteen men from the brothers' parish and one fellow veteran who knew 'very well' that John had fought at York.[131] Common and shared memories were important for petitioning widows of ex-royalist soldiers, for in such cases the certifiers were affirming a story told about, rather than by, an old (dead) soldier. For example, Alice Brown submitted a certificate stating that her husband George had died in the king's service which was signed by one of his officers and twelve others. Similarly, Elizabeth Starkey presented a certificate on which fifteen men affirmed her account of her husband's death.[132]

---

[127] WSRO A1/110, Certificate for William Welstead, Hilary 1662; CRO QJF 91/4, Certificate for William Yates of Nether Knutsford, Michaelmas 1663.
[128] DRO QS 128/28/3, Petition of James Potter of Chagford, 1683. On the distinction between knowing from experience and believing based on testimony see Maria João Violante Branco, 'Memory and truth: the strange case of the witness enquiries of 1216 in the Braga-Toledo dispute' *Historical Research* 79 (2006), 1-20.
[129] See Appleby, 'Unnecessary Persons,' 211-14, on a parish community's mixed motives evident from certifying.
[130] WSRO A1/110, Petition for Thomas Ezard, Michaelmas 1666; WYAS QS 1/13/4, Certificate for Richard Maudsley of Longpreston, April 1674; DRO QS 128/75/1, Certificate for Robert Spray of Lustleigh, 1681.

Certificates were the result of many people—officers, other soldiers, and neighbours—agreeing that the petitioner's story matched their memory of his past. Their primary purpose was not to give a true account but rather to add the credit of the signatories to the veteran's story of his service and the injury. For example, the twelve men who signed the certificate for Henry Elking indicated that the substance of his petition was true 'so far as we know and believe.' William Symons's supporters noted that they were 'credibly informed' not only by the minister and churchwardens of his parish, but also by 'several other inhabitants' that Symons's weakness derived from the 'severall wounds which hee received in His Late Majesty's wars.'[133] With an air of confidence mixed with perhaps a touch of fatigue, Hugh Cholmondley affirmed that he 'believe[d] the contents' of Roland Harrison's petition to be true, 'having heard the same confirmed for more then thirty years that the Petitioner hath been known to me.' And while the Reverend Thomas Belton could not himself recall and certify from common memory that Thomas Massey was wounded at Wakefield and York, he did declare that the 'contents of the petition as to the loyalty impotency and poverty of the petitioner [are] very true.'[134] Certificates were thus material records of an agreement between a maimed soldier's personal memory and the common memories of his fellow soldiers or the shared memories of his neighbours. In other words, by inscribing and codifying discrete and potentially disparate personal memories into an agreed-upon text, which would itself later become the documentary source for future enquirers, certifiers and certificates formed an intermediary step between memory and history.[135]

---

[131] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Henry Dixon, yeoman, Michaelmas 1661; CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of John (and George) Bickerton of Wrenbury, Trinity 1661.

[132] CRO QFJ 89/4.Petition of Alice Brown, Epiphany 1662, and QJF 90/4, Certificate for Elizabeth Starkey, widow of Bartholomew, Epiphany 1663.

[133] WSRO A1/110, Certificate for Henry Elking (written on his petition), Easter 1661, and DRO QS 128/98/2, Certificate for William Symons of Payhembury, 1675.

Certificates could also be, as Rev. Belton's language suggests, material witnesses of the certifiers' assessment of the veteran's fidelity during the troubles. They showed the community's belief that the veteran had not only given a true account of the past and was truly injured, but was himself a 'true' and honourable man, if perhaps only because he had once been a loyal soldier.[136] A veteran's fidelity during the wars was conveyed in certificates using a language of constant loyalty. Former commanders and fellow soldiers, drawing on their common memories of a petitioner, testified to his manner of service and consequent disability. For example, in the summer of 1662 three officers and one chaplain submitted a certificate for Ralph Hassall of Minshall, Cheshire, on which they affirmed that during the wars he ‘continually was ever faithful and loyal and has suffered much for his loyalty ever since.’ The next winter James Clarke presented a petition to the same Bench with a certificate from two ex-commanders which noted that Clarke had ‘served as a loyal and faithful subject’ to the late king, for which he experienced much misery. Early in the 1670s a former royalist officer, Major Thomas Latimer, presented the Wiltshire justices with four certificates, three of them dating from June 1660. The one from William Slingsby averred that the major had served under Lord Hopton ‘very faithfully’ and that he had been ‘made uncapable by a shot in the neck which he received at Bristol when it was besieged by Sir Thomas Fairfax.’[137] The fact that more than a decade separated the composition of Latimer’s petition and three of his certificates suggests that he had made at least one earlier failed attempt to secure a pension. Latimer had retained these certificates from the ‘Restoration year’ long after they were produced, underscoring their importance to him as enduring confirmations of his loyal service and suffering.[138]

---

[134] NYRO QSB 1685, f. 259, Certificate for Roland Harrison of Whitby (written on his petition), and WYAS QS 1/8/5, Certificate for Thomas Massey of Adwick, July 1669.
[135] I owe this point to Daniel Woolf.
[136] James, 'English politics and the concept of honour,' 309-10.

Veterans also submitted certificates about their fidelity during the wars which were based upon the shared memories of respectable sections of their community. Major Latimer’s fourth certificate, which was written during the summer of 1672, drew upon not only the recollections of his fellow soldiers but also his neighbours. Eight men from Cricklade, the place where the major was ‘born and bred,’ affirmed that he went into the king’s army ‘to do his service,’ and that they believed the truth of his petition.[139] More than a decade earlier, twelve men affirmed that Henry Elking was a soldier for the king, and that he never did 'forsake the service by going over to the other side.'[140] In 1680 thirteen men, including the constable and overseer of the poor of Bondleigh, submitted a petition on behalf of William Gaunt on which they concurred with his story of having been pressed, serving at York, and continuing 'to the best of our knowledge constant until the end of the late unhappy wars.'[141] The reason for putting more than three hands to a certificate at this time might have related, not only to the death of a petition's commanders, but also to the nature of the injury—not obviously war-related—or to local ignorance about his civil war record, or deficiencies in his reputation not directly related to his actions in the 1640s.[142] The exact reason for a particular petitioner's drawing deeply from the well of shared memories is not clear from his certificates. What is very evident from the language of these documents is that community support and shared memories could be very important for certifying a veteran's past and continuing loyalty.

---

[137] CRO QJF 90/2, Certificate for Ralph Hassall of Minshall, carpenter, Trinity 1662, CRO QJF 90/4, Certificate for James Clarke of Adlington, Epiphany 1663, and WSRO A1/110, Certificates for Major Thomas Latimer, Michaelmas 1672.

[138] The expectations and disappointments of royalists after the Restoration are explored in John Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 177-194, and Tim Harris, *Restoration*, 50-4, and 83-4.

[139] WSRO A1/110, Certificate for Thomas Latimer, Michaelmas 1672.

The desire among numerous maimed royalist veterans to draw upon common and shared memories of their faithfulness during and since the civil wars is evident soon after the king's restoration. In 1661 one of Christopher Cleeter's former commanders certified that the petitioner had 'behaved loyally and stoutly' while serving for one year as a horse trooper, that he had remained in arms until the fall of Oxford, and that 'since that time [he] ever remained loyal.' Similarly, Richard Heyes produced a certificate in early 1663 from an officer named Henry Slater who affirmed that Heyes 'was true and faithful' in the king's service as a soldier and trooper, and that he 'hath continued faithful unto his now

---

[140] WSRO A1/110, Certificates for Henry Elking, Easter 1661,
[141] DRO QS 128/11/2, Certificate for William Gaunt of Bondleigh, 1680.
[142] Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Ashgate: 1998).

Majesty,' never being one to rebel or 'turn to the contrary party.'[143] The continuing importance for petitioning veterans of shared memories of constant loyalty is demonstrated in the certificate for John Thornes of Skipton in western Yorkshire. The vicar, clerk, and ten other men from the parish testified with their hands in 1671 that Thornes did 'faithfully serve His Majesty under Sir John Mallerye and Major Hughes of Skipton castle,' and that he 'ever since [had] continued faithfull loyal' to Charles II. Likewise, eighteen men from Broadhempston in Devonshire in 1682 affirmed that John Tozer 'now is and always hath been a faithful and loyal…subject of His Majesty that now is, and of King Charles the First whom he faithfully served.'[144] If Mark Knights is correct that one of the consequences of heightened partisan conflict in later Stuart England was concern about the increasing fragility of notions of truth and certain knowledge, a petition from the 1680s with numerous certifiers might be the result of local tories rallying round the claims of an aged Cavalier, both to support his story's veracity and to demonstrate their solidarity with the principles of the old service.[145]

Certificates through which the neighbours of a maimed royalist veteran affirmed his loyalty during and since the civil wars confirm my earlier suggestion that the act of petitioning for a pension at Quarter Sessions commemorated a selective segment of England's past troubles. These documenters were material witnesses of a public agreement about a maimed soldier's past service and injury, and his honour, based on fellow soldiers' common memories and neighbours' shared memories. By subscribing their names to a certificate on behalf of a veteran or his widow, certifiers were confessing publicly at the most important local court of law and reputation that it was true that 'X' had been a soldier in the civil wars for the king against the Parliament, that he was wounded in that service, and that he had been and was still loyal to the Crown. To affirm before the 'political nation' of a county the veracity of these elements of a petitioner's story was also to remind them about these facts from their past. For example, three elements in a petition—that he had been a soldier in the late wars for the king against the Parliament—reiterated the reality that earlier in the century political differences within the realm had led to bloodshed. In the concluding section we will explore four related aspects of the troubled times which maimed royalist soldiers commemorated when they petitioned for a pension.

---

[143] WSRO A1/110, Certificate for Christopher Cleeter by James Long, Michaelmas 1661, and CRO QJF 90/4, Certificate for Richard Heyes of Warburton from Henry Slater, Epiphany 1663.
[144] WYAS QS 1/10/2, Certificate for John Thornes of Skipton, July 1671; DRO QS 128/28/1, Certificate for John Tozer, 1682.
[145] Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 276.

Embodied commemorations

In what follows pensioned veterans are considered as embodied 'sites of memory;' first, a reminder for their communities of the wars' central activity of injuring and killing, second, the triumph of the war's losers at the Restoration in 1660, third, the principles of loyalty and obedience, and fourth, to the troubling implications of war wounds for contemporary conceptions of manhood.[146] Commemoration evokes and brings forward qualitative dimensions of a community's past through public reminders and acts of remembrance.[147] After 1660 royalist veterans who petitioned for, and were granted, a pension from the state commemorated at least four aspects of England's civil war past and its legacy. First, the bodies of maimed soldiers were living reminders of the central activity of the wars, that is, the contest of killing and injuring between the king's supporters and those of the Parliament.[148] The political dispute between those men who remained at Westminster and those who rallied around Charles I in 1642 descended into a reciprocal infliction over the next four years (at least) of violence, leaving thousands dead and thousands more with permanently damaged bodies.[149] The altered bodies of wounded soldiers from both sides of the conflict would have carried their war damage forward in time, serving as witnesses of the violence English people inflicted upon each other during the troubles. Wounds, such as missing limbs, which left a real bodily absence, would have particularly reiterated the rupture in the body politic during the civil wars.[150] For example, the battle of Marston Moor was commemorated by Richard Stubbs's missing left arm, which was 'lost at that fight.' Less noticeable were the 'unhappie effects of war' recorded in John Richardson's body which had 'disenabled him,' and the pain caused by the bullet still resident in one of Roger Hellaker's thighs which meant 'that he cannot sitt at his trade nor travaile.'[151] Still, it would have been necessary for all three men to convince their judicial audience that their present disability stemmed from civil war action, and that it was due to violence inflicted by the enemies of the king.[152] Then these men, and hundreds like them, might receive a pension, and would be thereafter acknowledged publicly as reminders of the battles, skirmishes, sieges, marches, and watches in and by which the Parliamentarians and the Royalists strove in the 1640s to win their military contest by out killing and out injuring the other. For a veteran's damaged body to commemorate the wars it had to have been hurt while on the right, if not winning, side.

---

[146] The notion of a 'site of memory' within a modern national historical culture was first formulated by Pierra Nora. See his introduction to the multi-volume collection *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (Paris: Gallirand, 1984), and 'Between Memory and History' in *Representations* 26 (1989), 7-24.

[147] Barry Schwartz, 'The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory', *Social Forces*, 61 (1982), 374-9.

---

[148] For a similar argument see Seth Koven, 'Remembering and Dismemberment: Crippled Children, Wounded Soldiers, and the Great War in Great Britain' *American Historical Review*, 99 (1994), 1169,-1193.

[149] Carlton estimates that around 85,000 men from both sides were killed in combat and that perhaps another 100,000 died from disease, 'The impact of the fighting,' 18-19. He does not attempt to guess the number of wounded.

[150] Ewa Domanska 'The Material Presence of the Past', *History and Theory*, 45 (2006), 337-48.

[151] CRO QJF 90/2, Petition of Richard Stubbs of Congleton, Trinity 1662, QJF 101/4, Petition for John Richardson, Epiphany 1674, and WSRO A1/110, Petition of Roger Hellaker, husbandman, Hillary 1662.

[152] Under the 1662 Act for the relief of poor and maimed Souldiers veterans were considered disabled if they could not work, *S. R.* v, 389.

Second, the bodies of wounded veterans not only commemorated civil war violence, but also its outcome; in other words, that it was a contest with a winner and a loser.[153] Violence in war has two purposes: first, to determine an outcome between the contestants, and second, to make the outcome produced by their killing and injuring contest appear absolute.[154] After a war the dead and broken bodies on both sides usually testify to the fact that it ended with one side victorious. For example, after 1865 the casualties from both Northern and Southern states made visible the Union's victory in the American civil war.[155] The royalist veterans of the British civil wars provide a fascinating contrast to this nineteenth-century instance of the memorializing function of dead bodies and battle wounds; their injuries were reminders that the military victors, or at least the winners of the second civil war in 1648, had subsequently failed to establish a lasting political settlement. Thus, these men's flesh memorialized the political 'miracle' of 1660 and the return of monarchical government.[156] By petitioning for a pension for sustaining bodily damage while fighting for Charles I the maimed royalist soldier reminded his community of what Restoration Remembrancers such as James Heath and Edward Phillips pointed out in print to their readers, which was that the true outcome of the civil wars was not in fact Parliament's victories in 1646 (and again in 1648 and 1651) but the return of his son to rule as Charles II.[157] Thus, in a sense these veterans were living testaments of the plot by which royalist historians interpreted the mid-century decades: they were losers who became winners, much as the tragedy of the regicide had providentially metamorphosed into the comedy of the restoration.[158]

---

[153] Scarry, *Body in Pain*, 85, 113-5.
[154] Scarry, *Body in Pain*, 96, 121, 152.
[155] Scarry, *Body in Pain*, 119.
[156] On providential interpretations of the Restoration see Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 32-50.

The maimed soldiers who were successful in securing a pension were, thirdly, living memorials to the principles of loyalty and obedience to authority. The commemoration of past faithfulness to the Crown was one reason the government erected the pension scheme for 'poor and maimed' royalist 'Officers and Souldiers;' this policy was not only to reward past service but also so 'that others may thereby receive all due encouragement for the time to come to continue Loyal and Faithfull to His Majesties Service according to theire bounden duty.'[159] Veterans, their comrades, and their neighbours, used language which suggests they understood civil war wounds to be bodily memorials to their fidelity. For example, William Gibbs emphasised in 1660 that he was 'still one of His Majesties Subjects' despite having 'lost three fingers in his left hand' in the king's service. Likewise, William Booth had never deserted while fighting in England and Ireland though he was 'wounded and maimed to great prejudice.' Similarly, Moses Lane had fulfilled his duty faithfully although being hurt in his shoulder, arm and leg; he too had never deserted but 'stood still to his principles.'[160] Wounds were understood to be fleshly confirmations of a veteran's loyalty, as demonstrated in the petition of John Cornelius, who claimed that the 'good testimony of his loyalty and valour' was indeed

---

[157] James Heath, *A Brief Chronicle of all the chief Action so fatally falling out in these three Kingdoms*, (London: 1662), 442, Edward Phillips, 'The reign of King Charles' in *A Chronicle of the Kings of England*, (London: 1665), 778.

[158] Richard Perrinchief, *Basilika*: *The Works of King Charles the Martyr, with a history of his life...* (London: 1662), 13, 72-3.

[159] Article i of 14 Car. II c. 9, *S. R. v.*, 389.

[160] DRO QS 128/13/1, Petition of William Gibbs of Bradningh, 1660, CRO QJF 89/2, Petition of William Booth, Trinity 1661, and WSRO A1/110, Petition of Moses Lane, Easter 1662.

'witnessed by receiving therein two severall shotts in his side; one shot in his neck, one other shott in his legg, and a cutt in his head.'[161] The certifiers for Thomas Wayle in 1668 affirmed that the 'desperate wounds' he had sustained in the wars had left him to the present time 'infirm in his body,' yet they also noted that notwithstanding Wayle's injury-induced weakness he had 'ably demonstrated his loyalty to his sacred Majesty and hath always kept himself firm to the principles of the Church of England.'[162] An old Cavalier's disabled body, permanently weakened while fighting for the king and his church, could thus become by the instrument of a royal pension a corporeal monument which celebrated and encouraged, for as long as he lived, a strong principled adherence to legitimate government. In other words, his flesh became a site of loyalist, and later, tory memory.

Maimed soldiers who petitioned for a pension were, fourthly, walking reminders of the civil war's disruption of normative manhood, and of the king's care for deserving dependent men. To be a man in early modern England was to be strong; patriarchs needed to possess the bodily capacity not only to assert their independence but to support and to govern a household composed of subordinate men and weaker women.[163] Patriarchy was not, however, the sum of manhood; many of the most resonant masculine attributes celebrated in prescriptive literature and social convention, including strength, valour, courage, prudence, reason, virtue, self-mastery, and civility, were incarnated supremely in the honourable soldier.[164] Yet repeatedly in petitions we encounter men who testified to having bodies that were permanently weakened by taking up this archetypal masculine role during the civil wars.[165] The hardships and wounds John Briggs sustained during his service for the king had 'weakened [him] very much;' likewise, Robert Wright survived several battles and received 'many great wounds' which had left him 'lame and impotent'.[166] For many ex-veterans their old war injuries combined with the ravages of age to exclude them from the position of household provider. In 1662 William Merle claimed that the wounds he sustained in his head and legs together with his age of 'about three score and twelve' had disabled him. A decade later Robert Needham claimed that he could no longer 'expose himself to labour' because of the 'many distempers and infirmities [which had] fallen upon him' during his war service.[167] Similarly, Walter Williams was 'now become feeble' by the combination of great age and the wounds and hardships he had 'endured and received in the sayd warrs.'[168] Numerous petitioners also drew attention to the sufferings which their weakness brought to those persons dependent upon their bodily labour. Peter Bayley, who claimed that he had only 'his hard labour to maintain' his wife and children, was forever 'infeebled by reason of a wound which hee had at the skirmish which was at

---

[161] DRO QS 128/10/1, Petition of John Cornelius of Bishopsteignton, 1672.

[162] WYAS QS 1/7/2, Certificate for Thomas Wayle, March 1668.

[163] Susan Dwyer Amussen, '"The part of a Christian man": the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England' in Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 213-33; Alexandra Shepherd, 'From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 291-2. The anatomical basis for men's superior strength was explained by authors such as Levinus Lemnius using Galen's 'one-sex' humoural theory of the body, according to which the male sex possesses more 'vehement heat' and consequently more 'stoutness' than women: see L. Lemnius *The Touchstone of Complexions* (London: 1633), 69. According to a number of scholars this 'fluid' model of gender difference was not necessarily hegemonic; see Laura Gowing, *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeen-century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 22-43, Patricia Crawford, *Blood, Bodies and Families in Early Modern England* (Harlow: Longman, 2004), 3-7, and Karen Harvey, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 296-305.

---

[164] Amussen, 'Christian man,' 214-17; Smuts, *Culture and Power in England,* 13-15; and Barbara Donagan, 'The web of honour: soldiers, Christians, and gentlemen in the English civil war', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001), 365-89.

[165] For a quantitative analysis of the disabilities of Cheshire veterans see Tables 5b and 5c in Hudson, 'English county pension', 351 and 356.

[166] WYAS QS 1/7/2, Petition of John Briggs of Clifton, March 1668, and QS 1/17/1, Petition of Robert Wright of Weatherby, labourer, January 1678.

[167] CRO QJF 89/4, Petition of William Merle, Epiphany 1661, and QJF 101/2, Petition for Robert Needham of Prestbury, Trinity 1673.

[168] DRO QS 128/83, Petition of Walter Williams of Mary Tavy, 1678.

Warrington bridge.'[169] According to George Jolliffe his disabling maims meant that without charity or a pension 'his family [was] like to starve.'[170]

The veteran's use of a rhetoric of weakness reminded his betters that the injuring activity which is at the heart of war can and does transform warriors into a state of unmanly dependence for the remainder of their lives.[171] Their evocations of incapacitated bodies and consequent poverty were also drawn from the poorer sorts' 'public script' for relief, that linguistic toolkit deployed to hold their social superiors to an ethic of paternal responsibility and reciprocity.[172] This was a language to which the Bench would have been favourably inclined. Hudson has argued that the architects of the late Elizabethan county pension scheme no doubt perceived maimed soldiers to be a kind of poorer class within the community of honourable men who warranted hospitality from the commonwealth.[173] There is some evidence that this perception endured after the Restoration; Edward Turner prayed for a pension from the Bench's 'hospitall' [sic] towards his maintenance.[174] Rewarding maimed soldiers was an opportunity for the directors of England's 'unacknowledged republic' to show charity to a deserving sort of dependent men, while holding up before the public the cause of their disability—loyal service.[175] The king's maimed pensioners within a given locality would then have formed a community of weakened yet honourable men, enduring testaments to the virtues of fidelity to crown and Church.

---

[169] CRO QJF 101/3, Petition for Peter Bayley of Church Coppenhall, Michaelmas 1673.
[170] WSRO A1/110, Petition for George Jolliffe, Hillary 1661.
[171] For a modern example of this phenomenon see Joanna Bourke, 'Effeminacy, Ethnicity, and the End of Trauma: The Sufferings of "Shell-Shocked" Men in Great Britain and Ireland, 1914-39', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 35 (2000), 57-69.
[172] See Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), Steve Hindle, 'Exhortation and entitlement: negotiating inequality in English rural communities, 1550-1650', in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (eds.), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 102-22, and 'The Growth of Social Stability in Restoration England' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 568-9.
[173] Hudson, 'English county pension,' 65-74.
[174] WSRO A1/110, Petition of Edward Turner of Hindon, Trinity 1661.
[175] Mark Goldie, 'The unacknowledged republic: officeholding in early modern England', in Tim Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c. 1500-1850*, (Basingstoke: Ashgate, 2001), 153-94.

The legislation requiring Quarter Sessions to receive petitions from maimed soldiers lapsed in 1679.[176] The absence of any petitions after that year in the Chester record office suggests its JPs decided to adhere to the letter of the law, refusing to hear any more stories of injury from disabled ex-servicemen.[177] A striking contrast is provided by Devonshire; not only did its Quarter Sessions continue to accept petitions after 1679, but also took in more during the 1680s, at least sixty, than during the previous decade, just over forty.[178] By 1680 the civil wars were nearly three decades past, and the number of surviving veterans considerably smaller than even ten or so years earlier. Those still living would have been in their sixth or even seventh decade, quite old by early modern standards. The 'spike' in the number of maimed soldiers' petitions in Devon might have represented a final surge of elderly royalists seeking relief, or of particular parishes seeking to keep the rates down by shifting the basis of these indigent men's support. It is also probable that, in the aftermath of the popish plot and Exclusion crisis, the Devonshire Bench recognized the political value of publicly recognizing and rewarding the sacrifices and sufferings of men disabled while fighting against the enemies of the old king and the established religion.[179] Creating, or re-creating, a network of honourable old Cavaliers, would remind people of the primacy of loyalty at a moment when '41 seemed to be coming again, while also providing a natural base of support for popular Toryism.[180] Publicly rewarding aged royalists would also have demonstrated the benefits that went to those who remained faithful at all times.[181] Therefore, elderly and maimed royalist veterans, possibly ignored or forgotten by the later 1670s, could have found themselves and their disabilities being marshalled as propaganda weapons against Whigs during the personal rule of Charles II.[182]

---

[176] Hudson, 'Ex-servicemen,' 36.

[177] See the helpful list of royalist petitioners in Cheshire from 1660 to 1679 in A. Cole, 'Cheshire Rank and File: Royalist Soldiers in the English Civil War', (Sussex, Unpublished MA thesis, 1999).

[178] These numbers are based on petitions drawn from DRO QS/128, 1670 to 1690, with a known date. The Quarter Sessions of the west and north ridings of Yorkshire, and Wiltshire, also continued to accept petitions.

[179] There are five dated petitions for 1680, six for 1681, nine for 1682, sixteen for 1683, and nine for 1684.

The nature of war is to leave a record of itself on the bodies, both living and buried, of the men and women who were killed and injured there and then.[183] Maimed soldiers, such as one-eyed Henry Nicholls of Totnes and corporal John Wright with a piece of lead from Edgehill in his arm and their petitions, were (and are) important reminders of the massive damage inflicted upon thousands of Englishmen during the late troubles. They were also testaments to the selective oblivion at the heart of the Restoration political culture. While the Act of Oblivion commanded subjects to forget their former discords, the guilt of the Royal Martyr's executioners, and, sometimes, by extension the whole nation was recalled annually in countless 30th January Fast sermons.[184] The previous chapter pointed out James Heath, David Lloyd and William Winstanley's massive royalist martyrologies published with the licenser's approval in the 1660s.[185] The Act of Uniformity and the penal laws were defended with reminders of the prominent role played by the ancestors of Nonconformists in support of the Long Parliament and the Protectorate.[186] Although Charles II ensured passage of the Act of Oblivion because he wanted, and needed, to appease the moderates among his father's old enemies, the following year the Cavalier Parliament ensured that only those wounded for Charles I would be publicly commemorated.[187] Thereafter a story about a wound incurred to defend the rights of Parliament, the Protestant religion and the liberty of the subject would not be recorded on to a petition, nor would such narratives be certified by credible men. There would be room in the public domain for only one side's painful memories.

---

[180] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 257; Harris, *Restoration*, 214-20.
[181] I thank J. R. Jones for this point.
[182] Grant Tapsell, *The Personal Rule of Charles II*, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).
[183] Scarry, *Body in Pain*, 113.
[184] *S. R.* v., 226; Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).
[185] James Health, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, (London: 1665); David Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*...(London: 1668); [William Winstanley] *The Loyal Martyrology*...(London: 1665).
[186] [Samuel Parker], *A discourse of ecclesiastical politie*... (London: 1670), v.

The absence of stone memorials to the fallen and public rituals to commemorate their sacrifices in Restoration England might be explained in part by the presence of sufficient corporeal reminders of the carnage limping through towns and villages across the land.[188] Certainly for Owen Dod and others like him, the more time passed between the troubles and the present, the more his aches and pains acted as 'remembrances of his hard service' in the late unhappy wars.[189] How could England's troubles truly be over when they were commemorated by so many bodies? Such fleshly sites of memory, however, could not endure forever. In order to make posterity knowledgeable about the wars and the principles for which men had fought and died more permanent memorials were necessary. The following chapter will examine the way the late unhappy wars were made present, following the collapse of the Cavalier Parliament in 1679, in published historical writings, which aimed to create and become themselves public memories of the civil war past.

---

[187] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 177. For the Essex Bench's equivocal response to royalist veterans from 1660 to 1662 see Appleby, 'Unnecessary Persons,' 215-18.

[188] For instances of such practices after the American civil war see David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2001), 64-97; 338-45.

[189] CRO QJF 104/1, Petition for Owen Dod of Beeston, Easter 1676.

V.

Memorable Representations: civil war and Interregnum history in England, 1680-85

It has been argued that politics throughout the seventeenth century, and particularly during the early 1680s, was so much shaped by perceptions of the past that the Popish Plot and Exclusion crisis were an actual reliving of the years 1637 to 1641. By examining together a variety of published historical writings about the civil wars and Interregnum, reprints, translations, collections, memoirs and original works, this chapter demonstrates that the aim of their authors was for their text to serve as present-centred memorable representations that would suggest to the public purported parallels between the 1640s and the 1680s. The notion that the early 1680s recapitulated an earlier political crisis was actively encouraged by civil war historians who deliberately recalled stories about the 1640s with a view to shaping contemporary debates about the implications of a Catholic heir apparent.

*

In 1682 Thomas May of Sussex, future common councillor for Chichester, published a brief survey of English history during the 1640s and 1650s, entitled *Arbitrary government display'd.*[1] In the preface he argued that an historical comparison of the rule of lawful kings with the illegalities committed under the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes ought to deter people from any thoughts of resisting their rulers; such an action was demonstrably 'the only way to bring in arbitrary government whose most horrid Picture is display'd in the following History.'[2] The metaphorical link between May's history and an image of the past was reaffirmed near the book's conclusion, with the author declaring that he had 'fully finished my Draught, or Picture of arbitrary and tyrannical government which I have taken from the life, being the true History and Resemblance of the Monster.' His final exhortation to readers was to keep in mind the image of the past presented by his history, and then avoid acting in a way that would give the future the same defining defects; 'let all people remember what hath past, and by viewing this Picture of the most horrid and devouring Dragon, called Arbitrary and Tyrannical Usurpation, let them abhor it, and beware of falling under the same power, and into the same snare by any specious or Colourable pretence whatsoever.'[3]

---

[1] [Thomas May], *Arbitrary government displayed to the life, in the tyrannic usurpation of a junto of men called the Rump Parliament. And more especially in that of the tyrant and usurper, Oliver Cromwell. In which you have a clear view of the arbitrary, illegal, and unjust proceedings, of those persons under the notion of liberty…*(London: Charles Leigh, 1682). Biographical information on this writer, not to be confused with the Long Parliament's official historian of the same name, is taken from B. M. Crook, 'May, Thomas (c. 1645-1718)' in Basil D. Henning (ed.), *The History of Parliament, The House of Commons 1660-1690 Volume III: Members, M-Y* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983), 38.

This chapter examines a sample of published civil war histories from the first half of the 1680s. Previous studies have not treated these works together, with the notable exception of two comparative assessments of the collections assembled by John Rushworth and John Nalson.[4] There are several good reasons for revisting civil war histories released during these years. First, the nature and conduct of politics during these years was qualitatively different from the era of the Cavalier Parliament (1661-1679);[5] second, the legal context of writing and printing were altered following the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1679, and again during Charles II's 'personal rule' from 1681 to

---

[2] May, *Arbitrary government*, 6.
[3] May, *Arbitrary government*, 205, 206.
[4] Royce MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), 109-19, 120-44; Roger Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution Revisited* Third Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 18-24.
[5] John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 247-78, and Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 2005), 138-9, 407-10; cf. Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 357, and Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 340.

1685;[6] third, the quantity of references to the civil wars and Interregnum in the public domain, both in print and in speech, far exceeded previous levels, and the vividness of civil-war memory arguably prevented another conflagration;[7] fourth, the numerous evocations of the troubled times between 1680 and 1685 led Jonathan Scott to argue provocatively that these years were an actual recapitulation or 'repeat screening' of the 1640s.[8] More recently, Scott has claimed that the 'public memory' of England's late troubles explains the power of civil war history over late Stuart political thought and action.[9]

Thomas May's visual metaphors point to a new way of approaching historial writing during the final years of Charles II's reign, one that takes into account the similar stances towards the past taken in remembering and historical writing. Remembering and historical writings can be understood, as May's preface suggested, as kinds of visual representations. This is because remembering and histories offer themselves in place of and so in a sense stand for an absent presence—the past.[10] In other words, like a picture memory and history 'put in front again' or represent what was formerly perceived and experienced.[11] Furthermore, the stories about the past conveyed through remembering and historical writing could become for listeners and readers memorable mental images or pictures of what happened. As is well known mental images were central to the classical and Renaissance art of memory.[12] In histories images of the past were a product of their narratives and interpretation. The notion that a historical work offered a picture of the past was in fact a common way of asserting its reliability, adequacy, and truth.[13] The memorable images conveyed by historical writings were often intended to guide contemporary and future perceptions about public affairs, and to suggest certain directions rulers and ruled ought to take to preserve or enhance the commonwealth.[14]

---

[6] The 'personal rule' of Charles II, during which time he did not call a Parliament, despite the statutory requirements of the Triennial Act, lasted from March 1681 until his death in February 1685. Timothy Crist, 'Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679' *Publishing History* 5 (1979), 49-77; Grant Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse in the British Monarchies, 1681-5' (Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2003) and *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).

[7] B. Behrens, 'The Whig Theory of the Constitution in the Reign of Charles II,' *Cambridge Historical Journal* 7 (1941), 44; Scott, *England's Troubles*, 27, 437. For an argument that 'historical analogies' inhibited violence in London during December 1688 see Jason McElligott, 'Introduction: Stabilizing and Destabilizing Britain in the 1680s' in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 5-6.

[8] Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 355-8; Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 7, 27-33, and *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 17.

[9] Scott, *England's Troubles*, 20-42, 203, 435-42.

[10] F. R. Ankersmit, '"Presence" and Myth' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 328.

This chapter will analyze civil war histories published during the early 1680s as memorable representations, works that pictured the past for the reading public to foster polemical understandings of current political affairs. Like the Answers of defaulting accountants and the petitions of maimed royalist soldiers, the histories to be examined were purposeful recollections constrained by their political contexts. At the same time, civil war histories were also efforts to reshape the political landscape by drawing parallels between the 1640s and the 1680s. The variety of Whig and Tory histories, issued as reprints, translation, collections, abridgements, memoirs and original works, that presented memorable images of the troubled mid seventeenth century through which readers were to perceive the present and act in the future, suggests that historical writing during these years was precisely about creating and shaping the public memory of England's troubles.

---

[11] F. R. Ankersmit, *Historical Representation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).
[12] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), 8-12.
[13] Frank Ankersmit, 'Statements, Texts, and Pictures' in Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner, *A New Philosophy of History* (London: Reaktion, 1995), 241-77.
[14] On history writing as that which concerns 'public time' see J. G. A. Pocock, 'Modes of political and historical time in early eighteenth-century England' in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 91-102; Daniel Woolf, 'Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past' in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer (eds.) *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-Cultural Approaches to Historiography, Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 71-103.

Politics and history writing in crisis, 1680-1685

This section outlines the national context of historical writing by providing a brief overview of English politics from 1680 to 1685, of scholarly debates concerning the nature of political conflict and the rise of partisanship at this time, and of the altered condition of printing and publishing.

The years following the revelation in late 1678 of an alleged Catholic plot to assassinate King Charles II witnessed a series of intense political struggles at national and local levels which are most commonly known as the 'Exclusion Crisis and Tory Reaction.'[15] The former, which is usually dated from mid 1679 to early 1681, witnessed three general elections and three attempts by Parliamentary politicians to pass legislation barring the king's Catholic brother and heir, James duke of York, from acceding to the throne. The latter, lasting from the dissolution of the third 'Exclusion Parliament' in March 1681 until Charles II's death in February 1685 was marked by the crown's use of statutory law to crush political opposition and to enforce conformity to the established Church of England.[16]

---

[15] The most comprehensive treatment of the controversy generated by Titus Oates and Israel Tonge's conspiracy-story remains John Kenyon's *The Popish Plot* (London: Heinemann, 1972).

[16] For the ecclesiological and theological rationales for enforcing religious uniformity see Mark Goldie, 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 331-68.

Two principal aspects of the first half of the 1680s remain contentious for historians. The first relates to the nature and sources of political conflict. In his biography of Charles II, Ronald Hutton emphasises the contingent nature of political developments after the popish plot, arguing that the king's problems with politicians who sought to exclude the duke of York from the succession were caused by his own blunders and that his rule was never once in doubt.[17] In a series of works derived from his research on Algernon Sidney, Jonathan Scott claims that the controversy created by the popish plot and the efforts to exclude the Catholic heir from the throne related to the failure of the Restoration settlement to address long-term fears of popery and arbitrary government.[18] Mark Knights responded to Scott by arguing that concerns over popery, arbitrary government, and most importantly, the succession polarized politics and opinion at different times during the period 1679-81.[19] Similarly, John Miller argues that the policies of the king's leading minister from 1673 to 1679, the earl of Danby, increased anxieties about the ability of the ancient constitution to adjudicate a clash between the king's powers and the people's liberties and safety.[20] While also largely agreeing with Knights, John Spurr points out that political tension at this time derived from lingering concerns about the king's style of rule, the meaning of public and private interest, integrity, and honour.[21] Scott's 'popery and arbitrary government' thesis has received partial support from Gary De Krey, who agrees that political conflict did centre around the future of Parliament and Protestantism as well as the succession, and also from Tim Harris, who has highlighted the three-kingdoms dimension of the crisis, particularly the perception among the opposition in England that Charles II was encouraging popery in Ireland and arbitrary government in Scotland.[22]

---

[17] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second*, 357-402.
[18] Scott, *Restoration Crisis*, 7, 27-33; 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 108-131; 'England's Troubles, 1603-1702' in R. Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 20-38.
[19] Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 12-15, 362-65.
[20] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 115-120, 247-53; see also Paul Seaward, *The Restoration, 1660-1688* (London: Macmillan, 1991), 3-4.

A second area of historical controversy concerns the longer-term significance of these political struggles for the origin of modern party politics. For many years it was accepted that the activities of men associated with the Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury, which included petitioning, pamphlet writing, and presentations from constituents to their elected representatives in support of Parliament and exclusion, constituted the first age of parties; the advocates of exclusion were the first 'Whigs,' whose opponents were primitive 'Tories.'[23] In the 1990s this model was seriously called into question by Jonathan Scott, who suggested, based on his reading of polemical literature from 1678 to 1683, that 'Whigs' and 'Tories' were essentially the same group. 'Whigs' were people who from 1678 to 1681 were worried about popery and arbitrary government emanating from the royal court, while from 1681 to 1683 they were still afraid of the same threat but now coming from republicans and Dissenters, making them

---

[21] John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 298. See also Jane Ohlmeyer and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the house of Ormond, and the politics of Anglo-Irish Patronage' *Historical Journal* 49 (2006), 685-88.

[22] Gary S. De Krey's *London and the Restoration, 1659-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 169-17; Harris, *Restoration*, 138-9; on the king's ability to use the multiple monarchy to recover from the opposition's challenge and become the strongest Stuart ruler see Tim Harris, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 510, and *Restoration*, 170-4, 407-11.

[23] J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-83* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); *Country and Court: England 1658-1714* (London: Edward Arnold, 1986), 197-8; see also Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

'Tories.'[24] Mark Knights, Tim Harris, Gary De Krey, and most recently E. R. Clark have challenged this thesis.[25] While these scholars recognise that political opinion was 'fluid' in the late 1670s and early 1680s, they maintain that genuine ideologically motivated groups existed in the last years of Charles II's reign, and that Whig and Tory are useful labels for understanding opposing beliefs about the origin of government, the relationship between the legislature and the crown, the subject's right of resistance, the source of the greatest threat to Protestantism, and the need to enforce religious uniformity.[26] Grant Tapsell has recently shown that expectations that the king would soon call another Parliament enabled organized partisanship to continue after 1681, and that people willingly adopted the terms 'Whig and Tory.'[27] According to Harris, the most notable feature of Charles II's political recovery was the fact that it was achieved by a firm alliance between the monarchy and the Tory ideology and interest, and their concerted appeal to public opinion largely through printed propaganda.[28]

The government's policy from the spring of 1681 to win the hearts and minds of the people through the medium of print, or at least to appear to be carrying public opinion, was a conscious imitation of its opponents' tactics. The Whigs had taken advantage of the collapse of pre-publication censorship with the lapse of the Licensing Act in May 1679 to roll out hundreds of pamphlets and newspapers warning of the dangers of the popish plot and of a Catholic successor, advocating a mixed constitution against divine right absolutism, and calling for reforms to the religious establishment.[29] The explosion of printed materials justifying Whiggish opinions, along with Whig attacks in Parliament on the king's (former) chief minister Danby in 1679, their recourse to mass petitions during the latter part of 1680 to encourage the king to recall Parliament from prorogation, and the increasingly strident adherence among some Whig politicians to the policy of exclusion at seemingly all costs, came to be compared to the tactics of Charles I's Parliamentary critics in 1640-41.[30] A revolt in south-western Scotland led by strident Presbyterians in 1679 appeared to be an echo of the Bishops' Wars of 1639-40.[31] The similarities between the present disturbances and the opening years of the Long Parliament were a central feature of Tory, and then the government's anti-Whig propaganda, and, as we shall see below, of the majority of the historical writing which was published during Charles II's personal rule.[32] Although the monarchy did not attempt to police the press through licensing after 1681 as it had from 1662 to 1679, it was able to regain control over the print domain through legal action, the Stationers' company, and most importantly, by encouraging a torrent of Tory publications.[33]

---

[24] Scott, 'Exhuming the Popish Plot,' 125; *Restoration Crisis*, 48; *England's Troubles*, 439.

[25] Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, 367-70; see also Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 253-63; Tim Harris, 'Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories Get Off Scott Free' *Albion* 25 (1993), 581-590; De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, 272-329; E. R. Clark, 'Re-reading the Exclusion Crisis' *The Seventeenth Century* 21 (2006), 141-159. For the influence of political polarization on drama and the theatre see Susan Owen 'Drama and Political Crisis' in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 159-173.

[26] Scott's 'polarities not parties' thesis has been incorporated into a recent textbook on Stuart Britain; David L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 261.

[27] Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 10, 26-38.

[28] Harris, *Restoration*, 212-36; see also his *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 30. Along with polemical literature the government tried to win popular support from 1681 through demonstrations, sermons, ballads, and encouraging localities to submit loyal addresses and abhorrences, *Restoration*, 214, 266-81. On the significance of petitions and loyal addresses for the struggle to represent the public see Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, 258-305 and 361-4.

---

[29] De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, 160-66; Harris, *Restoration*, 142-9. For example [Charles Blount], *An appeal from the country to the city, for the preservation of His Majesties person, liberty, property, and the Protestant Religion* (London: 1679); Henry Care's weekly *Paquet of Advice from Rome: or The History of Popery*...appeared from December 1678 until May 1680; John Phillips, *The character of a popish successor, and what England may expect from one part the second*...(London: Richard Janeway, 1681).

[30] Behrens, 'Whig Theory,' 42-4; Mark Knights, 'Petitioning and Political Theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's "Monster" Petition of 1680' *Past and Present* 138 (1993), 94-5; Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 253-4.

[31] Harris, *Restoration*, 331.

[32] Tim Harris, '"Lives, Liberties and Estates": Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds.) *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 217-41; Raymond, *Pamphlets*, 356-8; Clarke, 'Re-Reading the Exclusion Crisis,' 146-7. Tories did associate the Whigs with Charles I's opponents before 1681, as in the case of *A Parallel between Episcopacy and Presbytery* and Roger L'Estrange's *The Committee, or Popery in Masquerade*, both published in 1680. My point is that after March 1681 the comparison became a stock component of propaganda emanating from official printed mouth-pieces, such as L'Estrange's weekly newssheet the *Observator*; Harris, *Restoration*, 252.

What had been a relatively free and open publishing sphere from the summer of 1679 to the spring of 1681 became thereafter more ideologically constricted thanks in large part to the political dominance of Tories.[34] This is borne out by historical writing about the civil wars and Interregnum examined below: ten works dating from 1681 to 1685 have a royalist bias whereas three are sympathetic to, or at least do not vilify, Parliament; those latter three were all published in 1681.[35] It is doubtful that Rushworth, a former Parliamentarian, would have been able to get the second part of his *Collections* published in 1682, or at least in the form that it was released in 1680.[36] Nonetheless, historical writings concerning the late troubles which were published in the absence of government licensing, and afterwards under the constraints of the subsequent Tory reaction, evince common representational features which justify treating them together; they brought forward elements of the past for present purposes, and offered their explanatory narratives as memorable images through which readers were to understand contemporary affairs. [37]

---

[33] Crist, 'Government Control of the Press,' 67; Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 265-95; Harris, *Restoration*, 237-50. On the paradox of the government's concerted effort at conveying its message in the print domain, while attempting at the same down to shut down or limit political discourse, embodied in the actions of the former Surveyor of the Press Roger L'Estrange, see Geoff Kemp, 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere,' in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 67-90.

[34] Tapsell's work does caution against an over-emphasis on the repression of opposition figures and views after 1681; ministerial factionalism and distrust of the king's intentions by members of the political nation remained after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 57-105.

[35] Crouch, *Wars*; Duke, *Multum*; the third, Whitelocke's *Memorials*, is dated 1682, although Blair Worden has pointed out that it was circulating in December 1681, see his 'Review: The "Diary" of Bulstrode Whitelocke' *English Historical Review* 108 (1993), 129-30.

[36] MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 106.

[37] The relationship between the quality of government censorship and its perception of security underlined by Jason McElligott in 'A New Model of Early-Modern Press Censorship' (Paper delivered at the University of York, September 2007), which will be the final chapter of his forthcoming book.

Reprints

The early 1680s saw a large number of older polemical works reissued to the public. This section examines two reprinted histories which evince a high degree of continuity between the first and second edition; a biography of Oliver Cromwell attributed to Henry Fletcher entitled *The Perfect Politician*,[38] originally published in February 1660 and re-issued by an anonymous editor in 1680, and a tract called *A memento* containing 'historical reflections upon the series of our late troubles' written by Roger L'Estrange in 1662 and reprinted twenty years later.[39] These two works addressed contemporary issues with their largely unchanged perspectives on aspects of the civil war past.

The purpose of *The Perfect Politician* expressed in the preface was the same in 1680 as in 1660: to summarise and commemorate the deeds of a great man in troubled times, 'not unlike Homers *Iliad* in a nut-shell, yet may it serve for a Memento of our ever-to-be-lamented unnatural divisions.'[40] Cromwell was credited in both editions with conquering both Ireland and Scotland in a manner which far surpassed the efforts of all previous monarchs, and the discipline of his army is said to have been superior to

---

[38] [Henry Fletcher], *The perfect politician: or, A full view of the life and actions (military and civil) of O. Cromwel. Whereunto is added his character; and a compleat catalogue of all the honours conferr'd by him on several persons.* (London : Printed by J. Cottrel, for William Roybould at the Unicorn, and Henry Fletcher at the three Gilt Cups in St Paul's Church-yard., 1660); hereafter *Politician* I.

[39] Roger L'Estrange, *A memento, directed to all those that truly reverence the memory of King Charles the martyr and as passionately wish the honour, safety, and happinesse of his royall successour, our most gratious sovereign Charles the II : the first part* (London : Printed for Henry Brome ..., 1662); hereafter *Memento*, I.

[40] *Politician* II, sig. A3v. MacGillivray considers Fletcher's treatment of Cromwell 'practically modern save for the allusion to craft and subtlety,' *Restoration Historians*, 23-4.

Caesar's.[41] The most significant deletions from the first edition were portions which the editor apparently thought were too complimentary of Cromwell's martial skills; gone in 1681 was Fletcher's favourable comparison of Cromwell to Caesar and to the Protestant hero Gustavus Adolphus.[42] Both Fletcher and the anonymous editor related Cromwell's extraordinary deeds to his natural ambition and his ability to ally it with the aspirations of the sects, who helped to 'mount our Protector to the highest pitch of Preferment.'[43] It was this relationship between Cromwell's religion and his will to power which produced the notable additions to the second edition of *Perfect Politician*: the king's execution, for example, was related to the guile of Cromwell's Independent supporters.[44] Nonetheless, the biography's assessment of Cromwell's ambition, achievement, and character, which was largely the same in 1680 as in 1660, was arguably more critical of the current regime than the Protectorate, especially given Charles II's relative lack of outstanding military and naval accomplishments since his return from his travels. In comparison with Cromwell the Stuart household appeared less than mighty defenders of the nation's interest and Protestant religion.

A similar interpretive consistency was evident in the second edition of Roger L'Estrange's *Memento*, althought it was printed without the first edition's dedication to the earl of Clarendon, and with a new longer title.[45] In the 1662 edition L'Estrange had directed the history 'to all those that truly reverence the memory of King Charles the martyr and as passionately wish the honour, safety, and happinesse of his royall successour, our most gratious sovereign Charles the II;' two decades later the title emphasised the work's treatment 'of the rise, progress, and remedies of seditions, with some historical reflections upon the series of our late troubles.' Apart from these two changes the 1682 edition was identical to the 1662 version.

---

[41] On Cromwell's conquests see *Politician* I, 84, 107 and *Politician* II, 72, 89-90; on his army's disciple see *Politician* I, 176-7 and *Politician* II, 139.

[42] These parallels are found at *Politician*, I, 29-30 and 49-50. The second edition does not, unsurprisingly, declare that Charles II's defeat at Worcester in 1651 'put a period to the Good Fortune of the Stuarts Family,' *Politician*, I, 207; instead, the battle is said to have ended the king's 'hope of restoration by force,' *Politician*, II, 163.

[43] *Politician*, I, 346-50; *Politician* II, 280-3.

[44] On Cromwell's religion see *Politician*, I, 99, 252-3, and *Politician*, II, 83, 200-1; on his dealings with the Independents from 1646-49 see *Politician*, II, 20-23, 26-7, 36-43.

[45] L'Estrange, *Memento*, I, sig. A2-A4. The first edition's one-page preface, which argued that it is 'worse to practice wickedness than to peint it' was also dropped, sig. A4v.

The text began with a general chapter on 'the matter and causes of seditions,' followed by six chapters totalling thirty-five pages which narrated the troubled times.[46] L'Estrange laid the blame for the rebellion at the feet of a cabal of Scottish and English plotters, who began to manifest their designs for absolute sovereignty in 1637. Their motive was simply an ambition to rule which they covered with claims to be concerned about religion and liberty. They were the sort of nefarious characters who would benefit from a change of government, and were joined by 'the credulous, weak Multitude.'[47] L'Estrange did not take a highly providential view of the restoration, nor did he give much credit to General Monck's efforts in 1660.[48] Instead he asserted that the very principles and actions which caused the wars also brought them to a period: 'Usurpers are not rais'd by Miracle, nor cast down by Thunder; but by our Crimes or Follies they are exalted, and Then, by the Fatuity of their own Counsel, down they Tumble.'[49]

By reprinting this tract with no alterations to the body of the text, L'Estrange demonstrated that his understanding of the causes of the wars and the restoration of the

---

[46] L'Estrange, *Memento*, II, 5-40.
[47] L'Estrange, *Memento*, II, 9-12.
[48] *Ibid*, 39. L'Estrange did contend that Monck was always acted from loyal and prudential concerns.
[49] *Ibid*, 18.

Stuart dynasty had not changed in the two decades.[50] More significantly, L'Estrange clearly believed that the danger of another conflict constantly loomed on the political horizon. In both editions he argued that

> if we look well about us, we may find this Kingdom, at this Instant labouring under the same Distempers; the Press as busie and as bold; Sermons as factious; Pamphlets as seditious; the Lectures of the Faction are throng'd with pretended Converts; and scandalous reports against the King and State, are as current now as they were twenty years ago.[51]

The former surveyor of the press might have felt supremely justified republishing these reflections without alteration or comment in 1682 in the light of the Whigs' political activities from 1679 to 1681.[52] Yet it appears from L'Estrange's reprinting of his unaltered history that at any time between 1662 and 1682 if he were to 'look well' around him to see distempers, factious sermons and lectures, seditious pamphlets, and scandalous news about the court he would have perceived the danger of another civil war. The reason for the emergence of distempers at particular times was unimportant for L'Estrange, for such actions were always the very 'matter and causes of seditions.' L'Estrange's civil history was unchanged after twenty years because for him the causes and perpetrators of the troubles were the same and were still present. Reprinting his unaltered *Memento* was therefore partly L'Estrange's attempt to encourage the reading public to see Whig activities and arguments as only the most recent instantiation of the party whose principles could, if unchecked, push the nation to brink of war.[53]

---

[50] It is also possible to argue that the perception of continuity held by L'Estrange's printer, Joanna Brome or Broome, widow of Henry, was decisive in having the unaltered tract reprinted.

[51] L'Estrange, *Memento*, I, 6; he was no doubt offering this pessimistic view of affairs in 1662 to justify his desire to become chief guardian over the printed realm; he became surveyor of the press in 1663; Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 148-53.

[52] The Exclusion crisis was thus not the first occasion L'Estrange publicly and polemically relived his 'fear for monarchy;' on this political phobia see Scott, *Restoration Crisis*, 37, 45; *England's Troubles*, 173.

Translations

The next group of civil war histories under consideration were translated and published during the early 1680s from earlier works written in Latin and French.[54] The purpose of these histories was to enable a wider readership to perceive the true origins and descent of the government's most recent critics.

George Bate, physician to both Protector Oliver Cromwell and Charles II, and Thomas Skinner, a chaplain to George Monck, duke of Albermarle, wrote separate Latin histories of England's troubles entitled *Elenchus motuum*,[55] which were translated by

---

[53] In 1670 L'Estrange claimed to have 'suppressed above 600 sorts of seditious pamphlets' in his capacity as surveyor of the press; *Calendar of State Papers: Domestic, 1670*, 502. According to one biographer L'Estrange was 'to remain a civil warrior all his life,' Harold Love, 'L'Estrange, Sir Roger (1616-1704),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16514, accessed 17 May 2007]. On the government's concern over the spread of news and opinion at coffee houses, and the politics of sexual scandal at the royal court, during the 1670s, see Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, 171-5 and 195-213.

[54] John Dryden, *The history of the League. Written in French by Monsieur Maimbourg. Translated into English according to His Majesty's command by Mr. Dryden*. London: M. Flesher for Jacob Tonson, 1684; George Bate *Elenchus motuum nuperorum in Anglia: or, A short historical account of the rise and progress of the late troubles in England*... Translated by Archibald Lovell, (London: Abel Swalle, 1685).

[55] Bate had written *Elenchus* in two parts, the first of which covered the period 1625 to 1649, while the second concerned 1649 to 1659.The first part of *Elenchus* also examined the king's prerogative powers; it was published in Paris in 1649 (Wing B1078A) and in Frankfurt and Edinburgh in 1650 (Wing B1079).This was an expanded Latin version of a tract, 'The Regall Apology, or, The Declaration of the Commons,' Bate published in 1648 under the pseudonym Theodorus Veridicus. An English version of the text, *A Compendious Narrative of the Late Troubles in England*, was printed in London in 1652 (Wing B1077). Elizabeth Lane Furdell, 'Bate, George (1608-1668),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1661, accessed 16 May 2007]. The second part of *Elenchus* appeared in London in 1661 and Amsterdam in 1662 (Wing B1081 and B1081A), and was reprinted in 1676 (Wing B1082). The second part of *Elenchus* appeared in London in 1661 and Amsterdam in 1662 (Wing B1081 and B1081A), and was reprinted in 1676 (Wing B1082). In 1676 Thomas Skinner, published a continuation up to 1667 (Wing S3948).

Archibald Lovell and published in 1685.[56] Lovell justified his labours in part by arguing that historical writing revealed lessons about human experience 'as in a Glass.'[57] The historical truths reflected by *Elenchus's* narrative were not hard to see. For example, Bate outlined two explanatory narratives of the origin of the troubles. The first story began with the tensions between Charles I and factious members of his early Parliaments; this same party later hijacked the Long Parliament 'under pretext of reforming' these political and religious abuses, all the while contriving 'to overturn both Church and State, and, in imitation of the Scots, to new-model the Government.'[58] The second narrative traced the genealogy of of the faction back to the Reformation.[59] The implications of these accounts was clear: Parliamentarians who expressioned concern for the safety of the Protestant faith in the early 1640s had employed rhetorical 'wheedles' to deceive the people and foment resistance to the king. Lovell seconded Bate's argument by noting 'Religion, the pretence of Rebellion' in the margin and in the translation's table of contents.[60] It would have been hard to miss the parallel Lovell was drawing between Charles II's Whig critics and the factious part of the Long Parliament who started the civil wars.

The prediction and prevention of civil disorder was part of the impetus behind John Dryden's translation of Louis Maimbourg's *Histoire de la Ligue*, an account of a 'criminal association formed against a sovereign under the pretence of religion.' The historiographer royal declared that this work was intended to 'prevent Posterity from the like unlawful and impious designs' of the Catholic Holy League.'[61] This was to be achieved by pointing out the general parallels between the practices and principles of the League, the Parliamentary rebels of the 1640s, and the Whig opposition of the 1680s.[62] Dryden argued that 'our sectaries and Long Parliament of 41 had certainly these *French* Precedents in their eye. They copy'd their Methods of Rebellion.' The League had also served as a model for the Whigs: for example, the action of the Estates-General in passing a bill of exclusion aimed at Henry of Navarre was duplicated by the House of Commons in 1680-81, and the Association formed by the earl of Shaftsbury in 1683 was another replication of the Holy League.[63] Dryden argued that an English person reading Maimbourg's history could appropriately replace the names 'Holy League and Covenant, England and France, Protestant and Papist' since between them 'there is scare to be found the least difference, in the project of the whole, and in the substance of the Articles.' 'To draw the likeness of the *French* Transactions and ours,' he wrote, was 'in effect to transcribe the History I have translated.' [64]

---

[56] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*… Volume III (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1813-20), 828.
[57] Lovell, 'Preface,' sig. A7v. History became necessary after the shortening of the human life span and concomitant shrinking of the pool of human memory following the Great Flood. The post-diluvian era had also witnessed a sharp increase in the occurrence of 'worldly affairs.'
[58] Bate, *Elenchus*, Part I, 17-8, 22.
[59] Bate, *Elenchus*, Part I, 73.
[60] *Ibid*, 43.

The purpose of Dryden's translation of the *Histoire de la Ligue* to English readers was thus to establish a kind of typological relationship between the two nations' past civil upheavals, and the men responsible for their outbreak, with the present state of affairs in

---

[61] Maimbourg, 'History,' sig. b5-b6; John Dryden, 'The Postscript of the Translator' Alan Roper (ed.), *The Works of John Dryden, Volume 18, Prose: The History of the League, 1684* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 415.

[62] On this literary practice more generally see Alan Roper, 'Drawing Parallels and Making Applications in Restoration Literature' 'The Language of Political Conflict in Restoration Literature' in *Politics as Reflected in Literature* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989), 40-45.

[63] Dryden, 'Postscript,' 402, 406; Roper, 'Editor's Notes,' *The Works of John Dryden, Volume 18*, 430-31. Dryden's recourse to typology is most famously demonstrated in his poem *Absalom and Achitophel*.

[64] Dryden, 'Postscript,' 402. For a survey of English uses of sixteenth-century French political thought and history during the 1680s see J. H. M. Salmon, *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 129-45.

England.[65] To read about the French Catholic League was to learn about and see reflected historically the English troubles of the 1640s and the political struggles of the 1680s. Readers of Dryden's translation could therefore appropriate the later sixteenth-century French past in a way similar to godly Protestants' use of ancient Israel's history; the trials and tribulations of the Jewish kingdoms and of France could serve as guides for understanding and acting in England's present.[66] Indeed, Dryden claimed that his translated French history allowed English sectarians, and others, to see 'a View of their own deformities' as in a looking glass.[67] Thus both Lovell and Dryden recycled earlier and foreign-language histories into English to make the disturbances of the 1680s appear to be an image of past conflicts. Recent developments in England did not thus necessitate a re-thinking or re-interpretation of the origin of the civil wars, but rather a recapitulation of earlier general explanations which blamed political distempers wherever and whenever they errupted on seditious parties with pretended claims to piety and concern for the commonwealth.[68]

---

[65] Roper, 'Drawing Parallels,' 40.

[66] Barbara K. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 117-30; see also Kevin Sharpe, "Reading Revelations: prophecy, hermeneutics and politics in early modern Britain" in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Stephen Zwicker, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 123. For an examination of the parallels French historians made between their eighteenth-century revolution and events in seventeenth-century England, see Geoffrey Cubitt, 'The Political Uses of Seventeenth-century English History in Bourbon Restoration France' *Historical Journal* 50 (2007), 1-23.

[67] Dryden, 'Dedication,' 3.

[68] Harris, *Restoration*, 300-26; Phillip Harth, *Pen for a party: Dryden's Tory Propaganda in its Contexts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 231.

C

Collections

Three major historical collections concerning the origin of the wars were published in the early 1680s by John Rushworth, John Nalson and Thomas Frankland.[69] These works employed a practice more commonly used by ecclesiastical historians of bringing together and representing documents to exemplify and to narrate the past; these collections also were intended to suggest ways particular aspects of the present were truly mirrored by their contents.

The second part of John Rushworth's *Historical Collections* was the product of his gathering, selecting, and editing documents related to important national events, purportedly begun in the 1630s.[70] Rushworth stated that his arrangement of primary materials presented his readers with a 'true and simple Narrative of what was done, by whom, and when.'[71] The collapse of censorship in 1679, however, allowed him to publish a collection which related the rise and fall of the personal rule of Charles I—what Rushworth called 'the particular Arts and Methods used in Government in such a long suspension of the Exercise of the Supream Legislative Power'—to bolster Whig arguments about the supremacy of Parliament and its role in preserving the nation's liberties.[72]

---

[69] John Rushworth, *Historical Collections: Second Part,* 2 volumes (London: J.D. for John Wright and Richard Chiswell, 1680); hereafter *Collections*, 2, Vols. I and II. John Rushworth, *The Tryal of Thomas, Earl of Strafford...upon an Impeachment of High Treason* (London: John Wright and Richard Chiswell, 1680). John Nalson, *An impartial collection of the great affairs of state, from the beginning of the Scotch rebellion in the year MDCXXXIX. To the murther of King Charles I. Wherein the first occasions, and the whole series of the late troubles in England, Scotland, & Ireland, are faithfull represented. Taken from authentick records, and methodically digested, by John Nalson, LL.D. Vol. I. Published by his Majesties special command*, 2 vols., (London: S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke, T. Sawbridge and C. Mearne, 1682), iii; hereafter *Impartial*, I and II. John Nalson, *A True Copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice, for the trial of K. Charles I* (London: H[enry] C[lark] for Thomas Dring, 1684); [Thomas Frankland], *The annals of King James and King Charles the First. Both of happy memory· Containing a faithful history, and impartial account of the great affairs of state, and transactions of parliaments in England, from the tenth of King James, M.DC.XII. to the eighteenth of King Charles, M.DC.XL.II. Wherein several material passages, relating to the late civil wars, (omitted in former histories) are made known.* (London: Tho. Braddyll for Robert Clavel, 1681).

[70] Rushworth, *Collections*, 1, sig. B1. Francis Henderson '"Posterity to Judge"—John Rushworth and his *Historical Collections*' *Bodleian Library Record* 15 (1996), 247-59. John Rushworth *Historical collections of private passages of state. Weighty matters in law. Remarkable proceedings in five Parliaments. Beginning the sixteenth year of King James, anno 1618. And ending the fifth year of King Charls, anno 1629* (London: Thomas Newcomb for George Thomason, 1659); hereafter *Collections*, 1. A 'surreptitious' second edition of this work was printed sometime around 1675; Joad Raymond, 'Rushworth , John (c.1612-1690),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24288, accessed 16 May 2007]; hereafter *ODNB* online, article 24288.

The absence of regular Parliaments from 1629 to 1640 was blamed on a triumvirate of counsellors—the duke of Hamilton, the earl of Strafford, and Archbishop William Laud—with Laud receiving special attention. Rushworth placed extracts from the prelate's diary at the head of each year from 1632 to 'relate more impartially' the power 'this Archbishop had upon the King.'[73] The presentation of primary materials showed that under Laud's influence Charles I introduced innovations in the fiscal, judicial, legal, and ecclesiastical spheres, which provoked opposition. For example, Rushworth highlighted Laud's cases against William Prynne, John Bastwick and Henry Burton before Star Chamber to document the overweening power of prerogative courts during the 1630s.[74] Following the report on the three mens' trial Rushworth turned to the outbreak of the tumults in Scotland over the prayer book, suggesting that 'the talk among [the Scots] was that the bishops in England were the cause of it, and that a Star Chamber would be erected in Scotland to strengthen the power of their bishops.'[75] The declarations and proclamations generated by the subsequent commotions in Scotland, and the king's responses to them, documented the Covenanters' violent rejection of prelacy, which eventually brought down the personal rule of Charles I in England.[76]

---

[71] Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, sig. A1. Michael McKeon calls this mode of representing the past 'Naïve Empiricism;' more helpfully he likens Rushworth's relationship to his sources to an antiquary's with his objects; *The Origins of the English Novel: 1600-1740* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 42-57.

[72] Rushworth, *Collections*, 1, sig. A3v; *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, sig. A1v.

[73] William Prynne, *A breviate of the Life of William Laud, Arch-bishop of Canterbury, extracted for the most part verbatim out of his diary, and other writings, under his own hand* (London: Michaell Sparke and John White, 1644). Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, sig. A2, and Vol. II, 86. As another example, in Laud's diary the entry of 5 December 1639 showed that 'after ten years Discontinuance,' Charles I called a Parliament 'upon the advice of 'these three great Men,' since according to the diary Laud had written that '*the king this day declared his Resolution for a Parliament in case of the Scottish rebellion; and the first movers of it were, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, the Marquess of Hamilton, and my self; and the Resolution voted at the Board to Assist the King in extraordinary ways, if the Parliament should prove peevish*;' italics in the original, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, sig. A2.

[74] Prynne's case in 1633 before the Star Chamber 'for printing a libellous volume called *Histriomastix* against plays, masques, dancings' takes up *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, 220-41.

Rushworth's record of opposition to innovations in church and state demonstrated that the 1630s were hardly a golden age of peace and happiness, but were rather marked by serious aberrations from the normal modes of governance.[77] John Hampden's 'great and memorable' trial before the Court of Exchequer in the autumn of 1637 was presented as the prime example of 'the disputes and conflicts' provoked by Charles I's reliance upon extra-parliamentary sources of revenue.[78] Neither would Rushworth let readers forget that in 1640-41 the Long Parliament had pronounced the final verdict on the personal rule of Charles I, nor that these 'judges' included a number of future royalists.[79] The *Collections* concluded with a series of extracts of speeches given by 'constutitional royalists' in late 1640 and early 1641, most of which criticised the state of the church or the current episcopate.[80] Undoubtedly Rushworth hoped that readers would extend the judgments of the early Long Parliament against extended absences of the supreme legislature and Laudian excesses to contemporary political affairs. Representing these condemnations of overweening bishops was arguably consistent with 'proto-Whiggish' concerns about the power of prelates in the House of Lords during the Danby administration.[81] Furthermore, given that the bishops were among James, duke of York's most vocal defenders, these speeches also implied that the prelates might be once again acting contrary to the interest of the public. Parliaments thus ought to be kept in being in the present to restore balance to the polity, and to secure the liberty of the subject from the danger of a popish successor.

---

[75] Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, 380-85.

[76] Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, 385-408; 750-88; 841-65; he based much of his account of Scottish affairs on a work by 'a friend to Moderation in Episcopal Government, and disliking violent Actions of the Covenanters' (394), namely Gilbert Burnet's *Memoirs of the lives and actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherеald etc* (London: J. Grover for R. Royston, 1677). The military and political collapse of the personal rule after the dissolution of the April 1640 Parliament, involving disobedient trained bands, refusals to pay Ship Money, opposition to the June 1640 canons, and the Scots' victory over the king's forces at Newburn, was related through documents in *Collections*, 2, Vol. II, 1190-1252.

[77] MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 100-105.

[78] Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. I, sig. B1v.

[79] The future royalists were Edward Hyde, George Digby, Edmund Waller, Benjamin Rudyard, Lucius Cary, Edward Bagshaw, Edward Dearing, and Harbottle Grimston.

[80] For example, Lucius Viscount Falkland's 'Of Uniformity' and Harbottle Grimston's 'About Bishops' Jurisdiction; Rushworth, *Collections*, 2, Vol. II, 1342, Falkland was 'with the king at Oxford and slain at

The judgment of the public was at the heart of Rushworth's collection from the proceedings against the earl of Strafford, which had constituted much, if not most, of Parliament's business from late March to mid May 1641, and at which the collector had been present.[82] 'Every Reader,' Rushworth argued, ought to suppose himself likewise viewing the proceedings via the collection, in order to 'make his own Comments upon the Law and Fact, as it appeared.' Rushworth claimed that the impeachment proceedings were 'the greatest Tryal whereof we have any account in our English story,' and deserved

---

Newberry fight;' 1349, Grimston was 'Speaker in the House of Commons at his now Majesties Restauration, and afterwards His Majesty made him master of the rolls.'

[81] Mark Goldie, 'Priestcraft and the birth of Whiggism,' in Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 209-31.

[82] During Strafford's trial Rushworth had been 'purposely placed near the Earl, to take in the Characters of whatsoever should be said, either against him or for him, and to the best of his skill he did impartially put into writing what was said in the case Pro and Con.'Rushworth, *Tryal*, sig. C1v. The book was his reply to an account of the proceedings, possibly derived from the short-hand notes of Strafford's secretary, first published in 1647 and then re-issued in 1679 as *An Impartial Account of the Arraignment, Trial, Condemnation of Thomas Late Earl of Strafford* (London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1679; Wing I68). The first edition was entitled *A Brief and Perfect Relation, of Answers and Replies of Thomas Earle of Strafford on the thirteenth of April, An. Dom. 1641* (London: s.n. 1647; Wing R68). The suggested attribution of the latter to Guildford Slingsby, secretary to Strafford, is made by Majia Jansson, (ed.) *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament* (Rochester, NY, 2000), i and xxxii. A case for the reliability of the transcriptions of seventeenth-century trials is made by Michael Mendle in 'The "prints" of the Trials: The nexus of politics, religion, law and information in late seventeenth-century England' in Jason McElligott (ed.), Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 123-37. For a recent treatment of the idea of 'treason against the state' exemplified by the charge against Strafford see Alan Orr, *Treason and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 61-100. He notes that Rushworth was 'a decidedly hostile observer' to the earl's case, 77, n. 76.

to be considered again because the charges against Strafford, 'of designing to destroy the security of every of their Estates, Liberties and Lives…to reduce to will and Pleasure' concerned all Englishmen.[83] The collector used a combination of his own notes, oral testimony, the Commons Journal, and contemporary printed sources to present his record of the proceedings day by day.[84] The passages from the trial were followed by the events of Strafford's final days,[85] concluding with Charles I's reflections on Strafford's death extracted from *Eikon Basilike*, and the bill passed by the Cavalier Parliament in 1662 overturning the earl's attainder.[86] According to the statute:

> to the end that right be done to the memory of the deceased Thomas Earl of Strafford bee it further enacted That all Records and Proceedings of Parlyament relating to the said Attainder bee wholly cancelled and taken off the Fyle, or otherwise defaced and obliterated…to the intent the same may not be visible in after ages, or brought into example to the prejudice of any Person.[87]

Rushworth's *Tryal* blatantly contravened the spirit of the law by presenting to the public again 'all Records and Proceedings' of Strafford's impeachment, arguably because his true concern was not Strafford's reputation but with the place of Parliament in the constitution. The 1640 Parliament had asserted that the ancient constitution was 'so reserved in the custody of the Supreme Legislative Power, that no Criminals, by violation of those First Principles, which gave Being to our Government can be judged otherwise than in Parliament.'[88] It was highly probable that Rushworth, who was a member of the three Parliaments elected between 1679 and 1681, had in mind the Commons' recent failed attempt to impeach Charles II's former leading minister, the earl of Danby, when he put together this work. The controversy sparked by Danby's royal pardon raised questions about the relationship between the king's prerogative and Parliamentary power which Rushworth might have believed partly recapitulated the case of Charles I's great minister.[89] This suggestion is supported by Rushworth's declared hope that in light of the record of Strafford's trial, 'right measures may be taken, that all our future ministers of state may escape the conjoined complaints of the three kingdoms against them; and that the government may be so administered, as shall best conduce to the happiness of the king and the kingdom.'[90] Presenting the records from the greatest trial in English history therefore offered Rushworth an opportunity to reassert the sovereignty of Parliament for dealing with threats to the happiness of the realm, such as a Catholic successor to the crown. It is possible that Rushworth hoped his readers would draw historical parallels not only between Strafford and Danby but also between Strafford and James, duke of York, and thus agree to the necessity of his exclusion from the line of succession.

---

[83] *Ibid*; '*Quod Omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari debet.*'

[84] Strafford's speech from the scaffold was taken 'from his Mouth, [the Author] being then there…with him (759). A 'Mr Elsing' told Rushworth that one 'Mr W—' had taken a list of names of 'Staffordians', which was later posted up by some of the multitude (59). 'The Speech of John Pym 12 April 1641' printed at pages 661-70 was drawn verbatim from a tract with the same title, (London: John Bartlett, 1641; Thomason Tracts E 208(8)). The proceedings before the House of Lords take up pages 101 to 674, and 706 to 733.

[85] These included the king's speech to Parliament for mercy, Pym's revelations about a plot to spring Strafford from the Tower, a note about mass protests of people demanding justice, Strafford's final speeches and writings, a recapitulation of his early career, the Scottish commissioners' charges against him, a brief description of his family and character, and then (at last) his execution; Rushworth, *Tryal*, 734-73. Twice in this latter section Rushworth intervened with commentary aimed at rehabilitating the reputation of the crowds that descended upon Westminster; 'they tendered petitions to both Houses crying Justice, Justice against Strafford, and when the Houses arose they departed,' 741, and see also 744.

[86] Rushworth, *Tryal*, 775-77.

[87] 14 Car. II c. 29; *Statues of the Realm*, v., 429. While Rushworth acknowledged that the earl died well, the bulk of evidence presented in the *Tryal* did undermine the rather uncritical portrait of Charles I's first minister in royalist martyrologies; *Tryal*, 762. Lloyd, *Memoirs of the Lives*, 17; Heath, *Loyal Martyrs*, 9; cf. Winstanley, *Loyal Martyrology*, 5.

Rushworth's historical collections defending the cause of and supremacy of the supreme legislature were countered by an anthology of primary sources assembled by

---

[88] Rushworth, *Tyral*, sig. C1v.

[89] On the debate over Danby's pardon see Harris, *Restoration*, 175-83.

[90] Rushworth, *Tryal*, sig. C2v.

Church of England clergyman John Nalson and published as *Impartial Collections*.[91] The 'chief Design' of Nalson's history 'was to do Right and Justice to the Government, and the Illustrious Memories of some Persons that were the great Actors upon the late Theatre of England.'[92] In effect what Nalson aimed to do was warn the public of the present dangers posed by Whigs and Nonconformists by representing the record of their ancestors' rebellion and murder of Charles I. For Nalson it was evident that Rushworth's material did not narrate the origin of the civil wars, but rather was a kind of guidebook for 'wicked men of same or like Principles, to act by the same methods and pretensions in Future Ages.'[93] Nalson understood historical writing to be a form of experiential exhortation for the public, for 'by the fatal example of their ancestors the generous English may learn that necessary caution to be wise.'[94] The wisdom Nalson had in mind was, unsurprisingly, loyalty to the established government in church and state.[95]

Nalson intended his *Collections* to remind readers of the principles and methods of the men most culpable for the troubles, those who had claimed, as their rebellious ancestors had, that the king, his ministers and the bishops designed 'to introduce Popery and Superstition into the Church, and Arbitrary Government in these Kingdoms.' Echoing Heylyn's narrative in *Aerius Revididus* he scapegoated the 'perpetual disturbers of the Peace of the Kingdom,' known during the reign of Queen Elizabeth as 'The Puritanical Party,' and lately called the 'Reforming' or 'Fermenting' party.[96] In 1640 this group used a Parliament that had assembled 'to remove a War from us' to unleash their destructive campaign against mitre and crown.[97] Nalson placed ultimate responsibility for the troubles, however, on a long-standing Catholic plot to subvert indirectly the English Reformation settlement through the agitations of the so-called godly reformers. 'We may observe,' he declared 'that the chief Rise and Original of our unhappy Divisions and Separations is fetcht from the devilish policy of the Papists, counterfeiting a design to advance the Reformation of the Protestant religion to a greater Purity.' The only way to end the real popish plot against the Church was for 'all true Protestants to unite with the Church…and to quit these Separations.'[98] Nalson's collections about the rise of England's troubles therefore related a small chapter in a larger and longer apocalyptic narrative concerning the true Protestant Church's struggle with agents of Antichrist disgused as puritans, separatist sects and Nonconformists.[99] The combatants who populated his books in a sense were types who had fought, and were still fighting, a war that stretched across time from Genesis to Revelation.[100]

---

[91] Nalson understood himself to be impartial and 'objective' because he held ''no manner of Animosity against Persons, but the Actions of the late times,' *Impartial*, I, xi. For the debate in among early modern historians about the value of an 'insider's perspective' in relation to 'disinterested' testimony about past events see Constance I. Smith, 'Review essay: *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History* by Julian H. Franklin' *History and Theory* 4 (1964), 100-101; Peter Dear, 'From Truth to Disinterestedness in the Seventeenth Century' *Social Studies of Science* 22 (1992), 625-7; but cf. R. W. Serjeantson, 'Testimony and Proof in Early-Modern England' *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 30 (1999), 195-236.

[92] Nalson, *Impartial*, I, ii.

[93] The alleged innovations in the fiscal, judicial, legal, and ecclesiastical spheres, were 'but the same Heraldry of Rebellion, Calumnies and Libels against the King, displayed more at large, and set forth with greater Art and Industry;' Nalson, *Impartial*, I, xxxvi.

[94] Nalson, *Impartial*, I, iii. Rüsen, *History*, 11-14. See also R. C. Richardson, 'Nalson, John (bap. 1637, d. 1686),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19734, accessed 16 May 2007]

[95] The perfect congruence between Nalson's political views and his interpretation of the civil wars is ably demonstrated by R. C. Richardson, 'Re-fighting the English Revolution: John Nalson (1637-1686) and the Frustrations of Late Seventeenth-Century English Historiography' *European Review of History* 14 (2007), 1-20. MacGillivray argues that Nalson was the most indebted of Restoration historians to present political affairs, *Restoration Historians*, 109.

---

[96] Nalson, *Impartial*, I, lxi.
[97] Nalson, *Impartial*, I, 480.
[98] Nalson, *Impartial*, I, xliv-vii.
[99] The persistence of historical interpretations among clergymen, both conformist and nonconformist, derived from apocalyptic eschatology after 1660 is demonstrated in Warren Johnston, 'The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 467-501; see also Achinstein, *Literature in the Age of Milton*, 84-93.
[100] The religious dimension of Whig and Tory political discourse during the period leads Grant Tapsell to argue that their respective proponents were 'warriors for God;' 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 111. The fact that Tapsell borrows the phrase from Denis Crouzet's *Les guerrier de Dieu: la violence au temps des*

Nalson's *True Copy* (1684) of the journal of the court that had tried and executed Charles I, drawn from John Phelp's record of the proceedings, also employed records from the late times to show the continuity between the king's judges and the principles and practices of Dissenting Protestants.[101] The recent activities of 'the remainders of the rebellious Faction,' by which Nalson meant Nonconformist and Whigs, 'making use of the same Arts and Engines which overthrew his Royal Father, exclaiming against Popery and Slavery, and by accusing the Government of Designs to introduce them, to fill the heads of the people with furious fears and raging Jealousies' had prompted the collector to publish the record of 'one of the most irrefragable Demonstrations of the Recorded villainy of those Persons and Principles.'[102] Dedicated to the duke of York, the *True Copy* was introduced with a seventy page background explanatory narrative to the 'Fatal Tragedy,' which pointing out the principles of the party who planned and (literally) executed the drama of the regicide. The Dissenters' separation from the legally established religion was the first step on the slippery slope towards full rebellion; the regicide was simply the most blatant demonstration of their principled animus to the Church and the monarchy.[103] Therefore, the *True Copy* retold the tragedy of Charles I's death from the mouths of his murder to reflect the true face of English Nonconformity to

---

troubles de religion vers 1525-vers 1610 (Paris: 1990), is a testament to the durability of the historical parallelism of Dryden and, as we shall see below, William Dugdale.

[101] John Phelps was one of two clerks who served the High Court of Justice erected to try Charles I in January 1649; his minutes were the basis of a journal presented to the Commons by the judges. C. H. Firth, 'Phelps, John (b. 1618/19),' rev. Timothy Venning, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22091 (accessed September 12, 2007).

[102] Nalson, True Copy, sig. A3. Similar sentiments ran through his pamphlet literature, such as *The character of a rebellion, and what England may expect from one. Or, The designs of dissenters examined by reason, experience, and the laws and statutes of the realm* (London: Benj. Tooke, 1681; Wing N91), 2; 'We know their [Dissenters'] Principles are inconsistent with the Ancient Constitution of the Monarchy, and both their past and late Actions have proved them true to their dangerous Principles.'

[103] Nalson, *True Copy*, xx, 125; xv, lxi. Sentiments such as these prompted MacGillivray to characterize Nalson as 'almost a caricature of the frenzied Tory clergyman,' *Restoration Historians*, 109.

readers, serving as a lasting record of its adherents' perfidy and the danger they still posed in 1684 to the established political and religious order.

Thomas Frankland's *Annals of King James and King Charles* also told the story of the origin of the civil wars largely by republishing previously printed documents.[104] Presenting elements of the documentary record gave readers what Frankland called 'a sight of these Debates.'[105] For example, Frankland described and explained the king's policy toward the Kirk and Covenanters by printing an extract of on of Chalres I's 'large Declarations' published in 1639.[106] Frankland laid his sources out without much connecting commentary, but he did occasionally insert marginal glosses next to documents whose principles he evidently despised, particularly those produced by the Scottish General Assembly. For example, the Covenanters' determination to use the power placed in their hands by God for 'settling the purity and peace of this Kirk' provoked him to note that 'God never put it in their hands, but the devil, who is the Author of all Sedition and Rebellion.'[107] Indeed, affairs in Scotland from 1637 to 1640 were at the heart of the work's explanatory narrative, receiving sustained treatment for just over two hundred pages.[108] Frankland focussed on the Bishop's wars to put the rise of the wars in England within the context of efforts by Calvin's British followers, going back to the Reformation era, to erect an ecclesiastical regime ill-suited to monarchical government; 'all this was for the advancement of that form of Government invented by

---

[104] G. H. Martin, 'Frankland, Thomas (1632-1690),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10086, accessed 16 May 2007]. MacGillivray calls Frankland 'a medical imposter whose venomously Royalist history showed that disloyalty was not among his defects,' *Restoration Historians*, 57-8.

[105] Frankland, *Annals*, 811; on Frankland more generally see Woolf, 'Narrative Historical Writing,' 221.

[106] The text appears at *Annals*, pages 757 to 765.

[107] Frankland, *Annals*, 745-57.

[108] Charles I's parliaments of the 1620s take up Frankland's *Annals* from pages 108 to 199, and 232 to 342. The years 1630 to 1637 are covered from pages 342 to 600. The Scottish troubles begin to receive sustained treatment at page 609 and remain the focus of the narrative until page 815.

Mr Calvin of Geneva…the very *Fundi nostri calamitas* for which the two Nations drew their Swords.'[109]

Frankland's history, which he hoped would acquaint 'every Englishman' with the causes of conflict, ended in June 1642, just before the outbreak of hostilities. His focus on the origins of the struggle between king and Parliament, and not the courses of the civil wars, suggested that Frankland believed that it was more important for his readers to be able to recognize similar causes around them, what he called the 'Artifices of …self-seeking persons' than for them to be reminded of their ruinous consequences.[110] Like Rushworth and Nalson, Frankland collected and presented a documentary record of the longer and shorter term causes of England's troubles, which hopefully would enable readers to recognize similar casual agents in the present. For example, to understand the agenda of Dissenters and their Whig allies truly in 1684 one could turn to the record of the regicide as presented by Nalson; on the other side, to make sense of the danger to the liberties of the subject from a long absence of Parliament Rushworth laid out the record of the exactions and irregularities of the Laudian ascendancy and Charles I's personal rule. In a sense, therefore, these collections presented readers with historical types or images from the past through which they were to perceive what was happening around them now and then to act in light of that knowledge.

Abridgements

---

[109] Frankland, *Annals*, sig. A2; 813-15. At page 433 he 'remembers to the Reader' the irregularity of the Scottish Reformation; the subsequent struggles between 'Crown and Geneva-infected Kirk' culminated in the Covenanter revolt of the 1630s.
[110] Frankland, *Annals*, sig. B2v.

This section examines three historical abridgements, which were condensed versions of longer antecedent works that most of Charles II's subjects could afford to buy.[111] Nathaniel Crouch, Henry Duke and John Kidgell summarized earlier published chronicles to offer a Whiggish view of the parallels between the nation's recent past and the present, and of the implications of those similarities for the future action.[112]

Nathaniel Crouch, a printer who published his work under the pseudonym Richard or sometimes Robert Burton developed a reputation for recycling histories.[113] His *Wars of England* (1681) for example, drew heavily from Edward Phillip's 1665 edition of Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle of the kings of England*.[114] Crouch was not, however, a slavish plagiariser of Phillips' history and his own interpretations of events were implied in passages from the *Chronicle* that he omitted. For example, concerning the Parliamentary forces' capture of the king's secret papers after the battle of Naseby, the *Wars* indicated that they 'were afterwards published, so that it proved a complete victory to the Parliamentarians,' whereas in the *Chronicle* Phillips noted that Charles I's correspondence was 'published (with less decency and civility than became such an Assembly) by the Parliament.'[115]

---

[111] Daniel Woolf notes that the increased demand for historical books in the latter half of the seventeenth century tilted the balance of author-publisher relations back towards printers, stationers, and booksellers such as Crouch; *Reading History*, 249.

[112] Nathaniel Crouch, *The Wars in England, Scotland and Ireland* (London: John How, 1681); *An abridgment of Sr. Richard Bakers Chronicle of the kings of England in a succinct history of the successions of the English monarchy* (London: Printed for John Kidgell, and are to be sold by Richard Janeway, 1684); Theophilus Rationalis [Henry Duke], *Multum in parvo, aut vox veritatis: wherein the principles, practices, and transactions of the English nation: but more especially and in particular by their representatives assembled in Parliament anno Domini 1640, 1641: as also 1680, 1681. are most faithfully and impartially examined, collected, and compared together for the present seasonable use, benefit and information of the publick…*(London: Richard Janeway, 1681).

[113] Robert Mayer argues that Crouch was a 'cultural broker' who mediated elite writings about the past to down-market readers; 'Nathaniel Crouch, Bookseller and Historian: Popular Historiography and Cultural Power in Late Seventeenth-Century England' *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 27 (1994), 391-419.

[114] Phillips, *Chronicle of the kings of England* (Wing B505). For a survey of the nine seventeenth-century editions of the *Chronicle* see Martine Watson Brownley, 'Sir Richard Baker's "Chronicle" and Later Seventeenth-Century English Historiography' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52 (1989), 481-500.

Crouch's book also contained crude pictures that depicted events from the reign of Charles I and the wars. For example, facing page 18 were three images, 'Buckingham stab'd by Felton,' 'Mr Pryn and Bastwick in ye Pillory,' and 'The Tumult in Scotland upon Reading ye Com[m]on prayer.'[116] While the insertion of woodcuts suggests that Crouch aimed to reach a portion of the reading public accustomed to shorter books with more pictures, it might also indicate which events he believed were particularly significant and memorable.[117] The first set of images could be seen as recalling the king's reliance on over-mighty advisors, the persecution of the godly during the 1630s, and the Scots' opposition to Charles and his Archbishop's liturgical policies. The third group of illustrations concerned the disposition of Charles I after the first civil war, picturing his flight from Oxford, his trial, and his death, implying that Crouch regarded the king's defeat and downfall as the key image of the later 1640s.[118]

The book's chronological division also conveyed the centrality of the king's death; the period from the opening of the short Parliament in April 1640 until the outbreak of hostilities in 1642 was dealt with in fifty-five pages, while in comparison the proceedings of the trial and the king's death used sixty-seven pages.[119] Many civil war histories devoted large sections of their text to relating the king's trial and execution, so Crouch's emphasis on those events was not unique. The way he presented the trial, however, was arguably more sympathetic to the High Court and its officers than most histories. Crouch incorporated into his book a contemporary printed account of the exchanges between the king and his judges with minimal commentary, and unlike Nalson's record of the event, included a full version of John Bradshaw's speech sentencing Charles to death.[120] In the speech Bradshaw rehearsed the Commons' case against the king, the crux of which was that the absence of Parliaments during the 1630s was ultimately the cause of the wars. By representing the text of this speech Crouch was arguably inviting readers to reassess the justice of High Court's proceedings, and the argument that the king's rule without the legislature had resulted in England's wars.[121] Crouch's history, told largely via his re-packaging of Phillip's *Chronicle*, suggested that an extended absence of Parliaments had been, and might again be, the cause of great misery.

---

[115] *Ibid.*

[116] These images almost certainly were lifted from John Vicars's *A sight of ye trans-actions of these latter yeares* published in 1646. John Vicars, *A sight of ye trans-actions of these latter yeares* (London: Thomas Ienner, 1646; Wing V327). I owe this to Gary Rivett.

[117] This is Mayer's argument drawing on Roger Chartier's argument about the process of 'typographic acculturation,' 'Nathaniel Crouch,' 399.

[118] Crouch, *Wars*, facing 139: 'The King goes from Oxford in disguise 1646,' 'The Illegall Tryall of King Charles the First,' and 'The Martyrdom of King Charles 1648.'

[119] Heath, *Brief Chronicle*; Davis, *Intestine Wars*, Phillips, *Chronicle*. It should be noted, however, that the type-font of the final three pages was at least half the size of the rest of the book.

A similar account was related within the historical pamphlet attributed to Henry Duke, *Multum in parvo*. The tract was published anonymously after Charles II's dissolution of the Oxford Parliament in March 1681 and the subsequent flood of loyal addresses provoked by the king's printed justification.[122] The story in *Multum* was derived from two earlier histories, Hamond L'Estrange's *The History of King Charles the*

---

[120] Crouch, *Wars*, 174-87; the speech is very similar to the text of *King Charles his trial* (London: 1649; Wing W8 and Thomason Tracts E545[4]). Nalson refused to include the complete text of Bradshaw's 'long Harangue, endeavouring to justify their Proceedings, misapplying Law and History,' *True Copy*, 100.

[121] MacGillivray's argument that Crouch refrained from 'the familiar denunciation of the Parliamentarians' to show only that 'there was, after all, something to be said for them,' does not, it seems to me, credit enough the weight Crouch gives to their position through the narrative structure of *Wars*; *Restoration Historians*, 166-7.

[122] *His Majesties declaration to all his loving subjects, touching the causes & reasons that moved him to dissolve the two last Parliaments. Published by His Majesties command* (London: John Bill, Thomas Newcomb, and Henry Hills, 1681; Wing C3000). Scott characterizes this text as 'as masterful appeal to public memory,' *England's Troubles*, 439. On the loyal addresses submitted by communities in thanks for the king's *Declaration* see Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, 316-28. Duke reminded those who had not followed the addressing crowd and had been labelled 'disloyal and disaffected to the present Government,' that Christ himself endured 'hard censures from his Countrymen the Jews upon the like account.' Duke, *Multum*, 2.

First (1658), and the 1674 edition of Baker's *Chronicle*.[123] Duke's alteration of these two older texts implied the justice of the Long Parliament's case against Charles I. For example, he omitted almost all reference to the Scottish Covenanter revolt but included Parliament's abolition of the prerogative courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, and Ship Money, the impeachment of the five judges who upheld the levy, and various 'laws passed for regulating abuses and disclaiming royal privileges.'[124] Duke also excluded the passage from Baker's *Chronicle* which claimed that Parliament's militia Ordinance was perceived by the king as 'the beginning of a War against him,' only that the Commons petitioned the king for control of the militia, implying that it was the king who was the first to resort to force in 1642. [125] The narrative stopped at 1642 because Duke claimed he did not want to 'launch out any farther as to the merits of the Cause.'[126]

The ultimate purpose of the historical part of the pamphlet was to draw a complimentary parallel between the 'Transactions, Principles and Practices' of the Parliaments of 1640 and the early 1680s.[127] Duke stressed the original good intentions of the Long Parliament, and reminded readers that in the *Declaration* from Breda (April

---

[123] Hamond L'Estrange, *The History of King Charles the First* (London: F. L and J. G. for Henry Seile, 1656; Wing L1190); Edward Phillips, *A Chronicle of the kings of England...All which additions are revised in this sixth impression, and freed from many errors and mistakes of the former editions* (London: George Sawbridge and Thomas Williams, 1674; Wing B507). Duke presented an abridgment of L'Estrange's account of events from the accession of Charles I to the opening of the Long Parliament. From that moment until 'the last day of 1641' when the king issued commissions of array Duke offered a condensed version of Baker's *Chronicle*; *Multum* pages 8 to 46 are a condensed version of *King Charles*, pp. 5-205.

[124] Duke, *Multum*, 46-7.

[125] Phillips, *Chronicle* (1674), 537; Duke, *Multum*, 48. Concerning the Short Parliament, L'Estrange had suggested that it might have stopped 'the torrent of the late Civil War' by discerning the breaches between the king and the people, Duke offered the parenthetical retort that 'the wisest head could not foresee contingent actions [or]...foretell but that His Late Majesty might have been advised by his Grand Council, and not by his Court Favourites;' L'Estrange, *History of King Charles*, 189; Duke, *Multum*, 38.

[126] The final section of *Multum's* history, pages 46-48, contains a numbered list of events based on the marginal notations of Baker's *Chronicle* (1674), 494-537.

[127] Duke, *Multum*, 3; the tract also contains several anti-popish poems and emblems; sig. A2-3, 58-9. From pages 53 to 57 Duke inserts a relation from the *Weekly Paquet of Advice from Rome* (no. 50) with a discourse on the interference of the papacy in English affairs under Kings John and Henry III.

1660) Charles II had acknowledged that the nation had slithered into civil war through unintended 'mistakes and misunderstandings.'[128] The key point of similarity between the older and contemporary legislative assemblies was that both Parliaments were dedicated to combating 'Popery and Slavery, many times slily [sic] introduced by some unworthy Sycophants, and corrupt Ministers of State.'[129] Duke's narrative was intended to encourage readers to support calls for a recall of Parliament in order to deal with the popish threats to church and government.[130] The recently dissolved Parliament of 1681, like the one assembled in 1640, had been truly concerned to defend the subjects' lives, liberties and estates from the popish conspiracy to overturn them. He understandably disclaimed any ability to predict what would be the outcome of another Parliament, or if there would be 'a fatality in these present years, as there was about 40 years since, which are by-past and gone, and all things buried (or at least ought to be forgotten).'[131] The implication of his history, however, was that a second long interval between Parliaments, in other words, a repetition of the 1630s, would be more dangerous to England's ancient constitution than another reforming legislature with aims that paralleld the one that first met in 1640.

In 1683 Richard Janeway, the printer of Duke's *Multum*, and John Kidgell published another abridged version of Baker's chronicle which was just over fifty pages long.[132] Lacking a dedication or preface, the work simply presented brief biographies of England's kings and queens, from Canute to Charles II, relating details of the monarch's accession, a short characterization of his or her reign, death, burial, wives, and a list of children.[133] The succession of the ruler's heir was usually employed as the connecting link between one reign and the next; thus the history's unity was maintained largely through an account of the principle of hereditary succession at work.[134] The history terminated rather abruptly with the wedding of Charles II and Catherine of Brazanga in 1662, which readers knew produced no issue.

---

[128] Duke, *Multum*, 5. On the 'Declaration from Breda' as an attempt to articulate a consensual view of the past see Kewes, 'Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion.'
[129] Duke, *Multum*, 49.
[130] This was arguably a genuinely Whiggish demand and not what Jonathan Scott calls 'a plea for the centre or "middle ground" to hold.' Duke, *Multum*, 4. Following the main historical narrative Duke reprinted a prophecy George Withers's *Prosopopoeia Britannica Britans genius* (London: 1648; Wing W3183) which he claimed foretold the restoration of Charles II. His hope was that the king would fulfill this prophecy and govern with his 'Grand Council.' Duke concluded this section with a prayer for future Parliaments; *Multum*, 51-2. Jonathan Scott, 'Restoration Process. Or, If This Isn't a Party, We're Not Having a Good Time' *Albion* 25 (1993), 629.
[131] Duke, *Multum*, 1-2. On the continuing expectations that another Parliament might be called, see Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 26-38.

Bringing the story to a close with the current king's childless marriage arguably emphasized to readers that the succession would fall to Charles I's second son, the Catholic James duke of York. Whether or not the next application of the principle of hereditary succession meant that the future was to be feared will have depended upon the reader's political convictions.[135] The editor of the *Abridgement* appeared to have suggested that fear was appropriate, since earlier in the text he noted that during Mary Tudor's struggle with Jane Grey for the crown in 1553 Mary had promised the men of Suffolk that 'they might still enjoy the Gospel so as King Edward had Established it,' but then 'afterwards they were the first men that suffered Martyrdom for the sake of it.'[136]

---

[132] According to Plomer, Janeway was a 'fanatically Protestant publisher during the popish plot,' *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers: 1668-1725*, 170. Janeway had three years previously printed Duke's *Multum* and pro-exclusion news-sheets such as *The Impartial Protestant Mercury* and *The New News Book*. Kidgell's involvement in both editions suggests that he was behind the form of the 1684 printing. The *Abridgement* was, and was itself a re-printing of Edward Cooke's 1682 epitome of the *Chronicle*; Edward Cooke *The History of the Successions of the Kings of England. From Canutus the First Monarch* (London: Thomas Simmons and John Kidgel, 1682; Wing C6000).

[133] The reign of James I is dealt with in two pages; Kidgell, *Abridgement*, 45-6.

[134] On the use of biological descendants as 'relay teams' which foster continuity and compress historical distance see Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 45-59.

[135] Knights suggests that in 1681 to be Tory was to fear civil war more than a Catholic king, whereas to be a Whig was to be more afraid of religious persecution than another outbreak of conflict; *Politics and Opinion*, 323.

[136] Kidgell, *Abridgement*, 41.

The implication was surely that York likewise might not prove faithful to his promises to defend the Protestant Church.[137]

Crouch, Duke, and Kidgell were each a sort of historical ventriloquist, speaking about the past through the works and in the voice of an earlier and better known historian. Edward Phillip's version of Baker's *Chronicle* supplied these men with an authoritative source through which they could tell their own story about the civil wars and draw parallels between the present and the past. These three short civil war histories transformed Phillips's moderately royalist narrative into a Whiggish picture of the origins of the troubles in an absence of Parliaments and popishly-affected dynasty. With such an image readers ought not feel safe nor secure under the personal rule of Charles II.

Memorials

The largest and most significant civil war memoir published in the early 1680s was the *Memorials* of Bulstrode Whitelocke (1682), who had died in July 1675. He had been a prominent Parliamentary politician during the civil wars and public servant to Protector Oliver Cromwell.[138] While purporting to come directly from Whitelocke's pen the memoir had in fact been edited prior to publication by another former Cromwellian,

---

[137] Tories had claimed that James's support for the Episcopal church of Scotland while he administered that kingdom rendered Whig fears for Protestantism groundless; Harris, *Restoration*, 250-2.

[138] Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs: or, An Historical Account of what passed from the beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1681). The manuscript of Whitelocke's 'Annales of his own life dedicated to his children' is currently at the B[ritish] L[ibrary] Add[tional] M[anu]s[cript]s 53726, 37341-37345, and 4992. Ruth Spalding, 'Whitelocke, Bulstrode, appointed Lord Whitelocke under the protectorate (1605-1675),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29297, accessed 16 May 2007]; hereafter *ODNB* online, article 29297; see also her *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Arthur Annesley, earl of Anglesey, and offered Whiggish readers a story of hope in the midst of their declining political fortunes.

Soon after the Restoration Whitelocke began to write an account of his and the nation's story from 1625 until 1656; the manuscript of this memoir was later known as 'Annales of his own life dedicated to his children.' This text, a second private journal covering Whitelocke's life after 1656, and previously printed documents, were the raw materials that went into the published version of the *Memorials*.[139] Lttle is known about the process by which Anglesey transformed the 'Annales' into the *Memorials*, but it is clear from the differences between the two texts that he edited the manuscript substantially, particularly by removing Whitelocke's 'dry and Erastian' Puritanism, and the memoirist's commitment to freedom of conscience.[140] For this reason, while the narrator of the *Memorials* will be called 'Whitelocke,' the label ought to be understood to refer to the literary persona created by Anglesey's editing, and not to the author of the 'Annales.'[141]

The *Memorials* told the story of the troubles by presenting a 'diurnal' of public affairs from 1625 to 1660, into which was mixed Whitelocke's political biography.[142] The style of the *Memorials* was as important as its content. Anglesey made a strong argument for the work's adherence to the generic protocols of classical history.[143] Its subject was public affairs during the wars in the three kingdoms, written for 'the civil Reader' who expected 'an Honest Neutrality to make Profit and laudable Spoils from the Quarrels and Miscarriages of others.'[144] Whitelocke had been a man 'so much upon the Stage during all the time of Action' that like Livy, he reported, as would any gentleman, simply what happened 'without Reflecting on Persons.' Anglesey claimed that Whitelocke's memoir was more even-handed than other histories which sought 'to stir Anger and whet up a rusting Animosity;' in place of 'Gloss and Artifice' were 'matters of Fact thus Simple and Unadorn'd.' [145] The argument that *Memorials* was impartial was made to enhance its status as genuine 'history,' and concomitantly, the political utility of its narrative.[146]

---

[139] Worden, 'Diary,' 128; *ODNB* online, article 29297. Nathanial Ponder, the printer of Whitelocke's *Memorials*, also re-printed the earl of Anglesey's 'Observations' on the earl Castlehaven's memoirs in 1682; on this controversy see Michael Percival-Maxwell, 'The Anglesey-Ormond-Castlehaven Dispute, 1680-1682: taking sides about Ireland in England' in Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann (eds.) *Taking Sides: Colonial and Confessional Mentalities in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin: 2003), 220. The son of a Nonconformist minister, and client of the former Cromwellian Sir Charles Wolseley, Ponder was imprisoned in 1676 for publishing Andrew Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpos'd*. He printed the first edition of John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in 1677-78; Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers: 1668-1725*, 240-41.

[140] MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 122, 134; Worden, 'Diary,' 123.

[141] This is a common practice employed by biblical critics in reference to the 'authors' of the gospels.

[142] The bulk of the work (555 pages) covered the years 1644 to 1653. The first 14 years of Charles I's reign were dealt with in thirty-two pages, the years 1640 to 1643 in forty-eight, and the Protectorate and Restoration (April 1653 to May 1660) took up eighty-eight pages.

The 'minimalist-neutralist' style and restrained use of commentary or moral reflection in the *Memorials* gave the memoir, and its purported author, a distinctly moderate voice.[147] The summaries of certain pivotal moments, such as the battle of Edgehill, were brief and seemingly non-partisan; 'both Armies,' Whitelocke noted, 'performed their parts with great Valour and Bravery.'[148] He reported the deaths of Cromwell and Bradshaw with no reference to portentous winds or to their exhumation and dismemberment in 1661.[149] There were gaps in the narrator's neutrality, however, as when he referred to royalist forces as 'the enemy,' and in an anecdote in which

---

[143] Hicks, *Neo-classical history*, 5-11.
[144] Anglesey, 'Publisher to the Reader, '*Memorials*, sig. A2, B2.
[145] Anglesey, 'Publisher to the Reader,' *Memorials*, sig. B1v-B2. He claimed that it was only in the time of Tacitus that the defeated side of Rome's civil wars came to be called 'Rouges and Rigicides [sic].'
[146] Hicks, *Neo-classical history*, 211-3.
[147] MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 143-4.
[148] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 61.
[149] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 675, 687; This was in stark contrast to the royalist histories such as W. C. *Commons Warre*, 133, Heath, *Brief Chronicle*, sig. D6v, Heath, *Civil Wars*, 408.

Whitelocke wondered at the 'rude multitude' of Oxford and their ingratitude towards Parliament's efforts to preserve their rights and liberties from slavery and popery.[150]

Whitelocke's neutral narrative did not prevent him from assigning blame to certain figures and vindicating others, himself included. He held Laud responsible for advising Charles I to go to war against the Scots in 1638, and for counselling the king to dissolve the short Parliament; the Archbishop, Whitelocke complained, 'was more busie in Temporal Affairs, and Matters of State, than his Predecessors of later times had been.'[151] Queen Henrietta Maria was indirectly culpable, Whitelocke contended, for the king's precipitous departure from Westminster in January 1642.[152] At several points in the text Whitelocke vindicated the earl of Essex as a military leader and politician.[153] Unsurprisingly, Whitelocke held the army responsible for the regicide, evidently resenting the ease by which they got Parliament 'to do their most dirty work for them.'[154] Whitelocke roundly condemned Cromwell's dissolution of Parliament in April 1653 as a blow to 'honest and prudent indifferent men.'[155] The biographical details woven into the

---

[150] For references to royalists as 'the enemy' see Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 96, 147, 199; the anecdote about the people's ingratitude is at page 107. Likewise, Whitelocke's lack of commentary about Parliament's sale of church lands would have been obnoxious to devout Church of England reader' *Memorials*, 231, 350; cf. on the alienation of Episcopal estates see Heylyn, *Aerius*, 429 and 478.

[151] According to Whitelocke, Laud pointed out to the king and Queen Henrietta Maria, both known to enjoy participating in court masques, the passage in Prynne's *Historiomastix* (1632) which claimed that 'women actors [are] notorious whores,' *Memorials*, 18. On Bastwick and the bishop of Lincoln's cases before the Star Chamber see *Memorials* pages 21 and 25; the Scottish war page 28, and the dissolution of the short Parliament page 32.

[152] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 51-2.

[153] On the factions formed at Westminster in 1643-44 as a reaction to the Irish cessation and Solemn League and Covenant with the Scots (Essex-Hollis versus Say-St John) see David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), 69-72, 85-92. Although the earl's enemies had blamed him for Parliament's losses in Cornwall, Whitelocke concluded that Essex 'was a person of as much integrity, courage and honour as any in his age; he was brought into this noose, by the wilfulness of others;' Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 98-9, 103, 113.

[154] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 358.

[155] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 529.

Memorials which justified Whitelocke's conduct portrayed him as a level-headed politician always striving for moderation in tempestuous times.[156]

Nonetheless, the restrained tone of the condemnations and vindications within the *Memorials* increased the chances that readers would in the future bear in mind the political messages of its narrative.[157] One such teaching concerned the causes of the wars. England's troubles had a contingent beginning, in particular, the convergence of the Irish rebellion in October 1641 and the king's 'sudden Action' in January 1642 to arrest five members of Parliament. The latter episode was 'the first visible and apparent ground of all our following Miseries.'[158] Other prominent instructions included the fickleness of the multitude's political affections and the mutability of temporal affairs. The former was evident in the changed attitude of London's 'giddy Multitude' towards the New Model Army in early 1647. Similarly, some of the men who loudly cried for the king's execution in January 1649 in order to ingratiate themselves with the 'present powers' after the Restoration were 'as clamorous for Justice for those that were the King's Judges.'[159] Presented in 1682 the lesson of the people's inconstancy might help *Memorials*' civil readers to make greater sense of the shift in public opinion since April 1681 away from the Whigs to the Tories orchestrated by government propagandists.[160] The most memorable example of 'how uncertain and subject to change all Worldly

---

[156] Here I disagree with MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 126. Whitelocke endeavoured to uphold the commonwealth's interest against the army's irregularities; he had agreed to serve on the army's Committee of Safety in 1659 in order to prevent its republican allies from reducing 'the power of the laws' and altering 'the Magistracy, Ministry, and Government of the Nation;' *Memorials*, 687, cf. 354-5 for his service to the Commons during Pride's purge.

[157] MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 137-9.

[158] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 45, 50-51.

[159] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 240; 368.

[160] Harris, *Restoration*, 407-11; cf. his argument that the importance of opinion out-of-doors was a lesson from the civil wars applied by the king's supporters after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, 'Legacy of the English Civil War,' 505-7.

Affairs are, how apt to fall when we think them highest' had occurred in April 1653, when the Parliament 'famous through the World for its undertakings, actions, and successes, having subdued all their Enemies, were themselves overthrown, and ruined by their Servants.'[161]

The earl of Angelsey's edition of Whitelocke's *Memorials* thus presented an insider's account of the rise of a mighty legislature brought down by forces of its own making. Bearing in mind the precipitous fall of the Commonwealth as narrated by Whitelock, however could possibly bolster Whig hopes of an eventual Tory-Anglican collapse, despite their sway over the political landscape from 1682. Memorable images of fallen political titans from the nation's past could possibly encourage a kind of watchful quietism among the Stuart's critics, an outlook with which many Nonconformists had been familiar since 1662.[162] In 1682 it was a view of the past which offered hope for a new generation of prudent and honest readers rendered powerless by shifting tides of politics and opinion.[163] These included the editor and publisher of the *Memorials* himself, ejected from the Privy Council in August of that year.[164]

Historical Pictures

---

[161] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 529.

[162] Blair Worden, 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, and the Restoration' in Gerald Maclean (ed.), *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 130; N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 132-47.

[163] This is Anglesey's emphasis, since the 'Annales' stressed the need for Whitelocke's children and the nation to avoid in the future the disasters he narrates; MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 126.

[164] Percevel-Maxwell, 'Anglesey-Ormond Dispute,' 222. The earl wrote an 'advice' to Charles II after his disgrace in which he blamed the civil wars on discontents arising from the absence of parliaments during Charles I's personal rule; it was published in 1694, eight years after his death; *The Earl of Anglesey's state of the government & kingdom: prepared and intended for His Majesty, King Charles II. In the year 1682…By Sir John Thompson, baronet* (London: Samuel Crouch, 1694; Wing T1000).

This section focuses on civil war histories published in the early 1680s that did not primarily use antecent texts or manuscripts as vehicles for narrating the troubled times and making sense of the present; Thomas May's *Arbitrary Government display'd* and William Dugdale's *Short view of the late troubles*.[165] As their titles suggest, these histories were particularly concerned to offer their readers historical images for seeing the parallels between the present and the civil war past, and the direction future public affairs ought to take in light of these continuities.

The author of *Arbitrary Government displayed* (1682), Thomas May of Sussex, was explicit that his history was prompted by what he had lately witnessed throughout the political arena. May had perceived that 'spirit of discontent' recently possessed large numbers of people, who had expressed great fears for the safety of English Protestantism and the possibility of arbitrary government in the future. Arbitrary government was defined as 'the Rule of any Person or Persons, by their own will and Authority, without being tyed to the Rules, Methods, and Directions of the Laws of the Land, and a Converting of this most glorious Monarchy, into Tyranny.'[166] A look back at public affairs forty years past would demonstrate, May argued, the profound illegalities of the regimes which sprang forth from the people's resistance to their legitimate king. Such a memorable display ought to deter any adherence to men who principles evinced similar designs in the present.

---

[165] May, *Arbitrary government*; William Dugdale, *A short view of the late troubles in England; briefly setting forth, their rise, growth, and tragical conclusion. As also, some parallel thereof with the barons-wars in the time of King Henry III. But chiefly with that in France, called the Holy League, in the reign of Henry III. and Henry IV. late kings of that realm...* (London: Moses Pitt, 1681).

[166] May, *Arbitrary government*, 3.

May drew upon the world of theatre to guide the reader's understanding of politics during the Interregnum—it was a five-act tragedy.[167] The metaphor of tragedy not only conveyed May's qualitative assessment of the Interregnum period, but also tied the post-1648 regimes together into a single cycle of tyrannical rule. For example, the 'rotation' from Commonwealth to Protectorate had not fundamentally changed the story's plot, since 'arbitrary government, not the Monarchy [was] restored, and instead of the many Tyrants one as boundless [was] constituted by a military power.'[168] He offered numerous examples of the illegitimate acts committed by and under the Long Parliament, the Rump and the Protectorate. For example, the maintenance of the army required the Rump to collect 'a standing Tax of ninety thousand pound a Month,' which May argued was a strange way for the men 'who made such a stir about Ship-Money' to help the nation 'better see their Freedom and Liberty.'[169] As the previous quotation suggests, the exactions of the Rump and Protectorate were contrasted by May with the relative mildness of Charles I's personal rule during the 1630s. The Rump had jailed John Lilburne for publishing *Englands New Chains Discovered* in 1649, and refused him an allowance of food and drink; 'this under a King had been Tyrannical, but [was] Prudence in this free State.'[170] Noting that the Committee of Safety had forbidden petitioning in late 1659, May declared 'thus you see, these very men, who had set such examples of this nature so frequently by getting Subscriptions to Petitions and Remonstrances to the Authority then in being, could not endure it, now it thwarted their humours and interest…Mind therefore the Justice of these men.'[171] The aside concerning 'these men' was no doubt offered to suggest a historical parallel between the methods of Whig politicians and the more 'fiery spirits' of the Long Parliament.[172]

---

[167] The first act concerned the rise and fall of the Commonwealth, and at ninety-five pages took up just under half of the whole book. The second act traced the 'tyrannic usurpation' Oliver Cromwell and his son Richard, while the return of the Rump Parliament in 1659 constituted the third; these two 'acts' are dealt with over seventy-one pages. The administration of the army's Committee of Safety was the penultimate act, followed by the fifth and final act 'of our Tragedy or Trage-comedy since it ends happily,' the Rump restored (again) and dissolved; the final two sections needed twenty-five pages.

[168] May, *Arbitrary government*, 106.

[169] May, *Arbitrary government*, 55; he also claimed that the first Dutch war forced 'the Junto' to raise 'a heavy tax upon the People of £120, 000 per month;' 84.

[170] May, *Arbitrary government*, 52-3; he was referring indirectly to the punishments meted out to Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in 1637.

May was conscious that his portrait of the troubled times was partial, but he admitted that he never aspired to completeness.[173] He deliberately did not focus on the causes of the civil wars but rather presented a view of the consequences of the Long Parliament's rebellion to discourage disobedience and resistance now and in the future.[174] Mixing metaphors of representation and orientation, May argued that his book displayed the nation's past experience 'in a Glass,' thereby instructing its governors how not to run again 'upon the same Rocks,' and its people how to avoid again 'totally the subverting the Monarchy and fundamental laws of the land.'[175] The clear warning from May's picture of the Interregnum for readers was that tyranny, disorder and illegalities followed resistance against a legitimate king. This memorable image from the tumultuous past was pictured in May's history to dissuade the people from supporting the king's Whiggish critics.

---

[171] May, *Arbitrary government*, 191.
[172] Mark Knights, 'London's "Monster" Petition of 1680', 94-5.
[173] While May apologized for not offering a detailed narrative of the king's trial, he contended that such an inclusion was contrary to his purpose, which was to present 'only a brief Narrative of these Usurpers' proceedings, that the World might behold the true Picture of Arbitrary Government, and Tyrannical Rule, and not an exact Chronicle or History of those times,' *Arbitrary government*, 36.
[174] The visual and representational metaphors in the introduction are striking: 'If we look down from this Hill of Time present, thorow the Optick of History, on Time past, we behold the first Ages as in Landskip only, not in a due Proportion, being much lessened in the Relation; the middle Ages are more clearly viewed, and lye open to discovery, and are more largely Displayed in History: but again, the more near, or next to the Mountain of Time present, are also covered in a certain obscurity, and as it were over-shadowed by the Mount of Time present, that Truth is traced with a faint touch, as usually things are not so clearly seen, as at a longer distance;' *Arbitrary government*, 7-8.
[175] May, *Arbitrary government*, 6.

William Dugdale's *Short view of the late troubles* was apparently begun while he was with Charles I at Oxford during the first civil war and subsequently taken again by the mid 1670s. Published in 1681, it was to be his last major publication.[176] Dugdale devoted most of his analysis to revealing the origins of the civil wars and the quest for a settlement during the 1640s.[177] Unlike May, the venerable antiquary aimed to honour to the memory of the Charles I and his cause by heaping all the blame for the troubles on his enemies.[178] The *Short view* presented a true portrait of the perpetrators of the civil wars and their contemporary descendants; Dugdale even asked readers to forgive the severe tone of his remarks about 'what is past' since they were the consequence of his 'just indignation conceiv'd against those men, who under specious pretences mask'd the most black designs.'[179]

Dugdale's scapegoats were the Presbyterians; 'the main end of this Narrative' he wrote, was 'historically to shew the growth and effects of Presbytery.'[180] Much of Dugdale's account of the war's origin recapitulated Peter Heylyn's history of the Presbyterians, which had conflated Calvinist and Catholic sixteenth-century defenders of popular sovereignty and the people's right to resist tyrants with the Long Parliament's advocates of godly reform.[181] The Presbyterian method to cause trouble with print and preaching, 'according to the pattern of Geneva,' had prepared the people, he declared, particularly of London, to rise up against the king.[182] Dugdale argued that the actions of the Presbyterians in Britain followed pattern set by the French Holy League in the later sixteenth century so closely that 'we have just reason enough to conceive that the Contrivers of this Rebellion, did borrow the Plott from thence.'[183] He also catalogued examples of how the Parliament under the Presbyterians had oppressed the nation with high taxes and ran roughshod over the laws of the land, despite their protestations on behalf of the liberty of the subject.[184] Parliament's declarations about defending the Protestant religion were belied by 'the particular Imprisonments, Plunderings, and other oppressions, exercised by them towards most of our great and most able Divines.'[185] The downfall of the Presbyterians after the first civil war further demonstrated the consequences of their political theories and ecclesiology: those who had 'first kindled the flames of Civil war amongst us,' were eventually overthrown by the Independents 'upon the like principles.'[186]

---

[176] Stephen K. Roberts, '"Ordering and Methodizing": William Dugdale in Restoration England' (Unpublished essay, 2007), 17-20. I am very grateful to Dr Roberts for permission to read this essay from a forthcoming collection on Dugdale.

[177] The chronological division of the *Short view* was as follows: sixteenth-century origins to 1640 November, cap. 1-6, pages 1 to 59; 1640 November to 1642 January, cap. 7-9, pages 65 to 82; 1642 January to 1646 December, cap. 10-21, pages 82 to 136, and 185 to 226; 1647 June to 1649 January, cap. 22-32, pages 226 to 294 and 361 to 384; 1649 January to 1658 September, cap. 33-39, pages 384 to 439 and 449 and 61; 1658 September to 1660 May, cap. 40-42, pages 461 to 488.

[178] Dugdale, *Short view*, 378-84; MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 55-7. Graham Parry argues that Dugdale's entire oeuvre was in part an act of commemoration, 'to get the record of the past straight and preserve it without prejudice,' *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 226.

[179] Dugdale, *Short view*, sig. A2; sig. A3v. Roberts has noted from a comparison of the manuscript of *Short view* at Merevale Hall (Warks.) that Dugdale toned down his rhetoric in the published version; he suggests this was to avoid giving too much offence to his Presbyterian associates such as John Rushworth and Sir Edward Harley, and to keep the work above the level of a tirade; 'Dugdale in Restoration England,' 19.

[180] Dugdale, *Short view*, 132;

---

[181] Dugdale encouraged readers to turn to Heylyn's *Aerius Redivius* or '*the History of the Reformation of the Church of England* printed at London 1679, pg. 366,' for the author's observation that 'the Romish Perswasion, and the Presbyterians do hold; as *that the office of Priests and Bishops is one and the same*,' *Short view*, 19.

[182] Dugdale, *Short view*, 36. The success of this seditious preaching in the capital was evident from London's enthusiastic support for Parliament, both in men listed and material raised; 'how forward and active the Londoners were to promote this rebellion,' Dugdale noted, 'can hardly be imagined;' *Short view*, 99; on the importance of London to the 'contrivers' see also 40, 66, 79-80, 82, 87, and 92.

[183] Dugdale, *Short view*, 592-9 on the barons' revolt; 600-650 on the Holy League. Dugdale's source for French history was Arrigo (or Enrico) Caterino Davila's *History of the Civil Wars in France* and Camden's *Annal* of *Elizabeth*, 1589, page 577; at 626. On Clarendon's use of the former see Paul Seaward, 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the civil wars of Europe' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 289-303.

[184] Dugdale, *Short view*, 577-97; 112, 127-8, 130.

[185] Dugdale, *Short view*, 558, The antiquary's righteous indignation was kindled relating the damage wrought to Lichfield cathedral by Lord Brooke's soldiers' 'pulling down the curious Carved work; battering in pieces the Costly Windows; and destroying the Evidences and Records belonging to that Church.'554-77; 'the like hath not been seen in this realm since the Pagan Danes upon their Invasions, exercised their Heathenish cruelties here.'

Dugdale's history clearly aimed to show that those men who had accused Charles I of tending toward popery and arbitrary government were in fact speaking of their own secret designs. The political turmoil of the 1640s was a particular manifestation of the principle that rebellion and anarchy always began with 'the fairest Pretences for Reforming of somewhat amiss in the Government,' and were led by men whose piety gained them followers, while hiding their real ambition, which was 'to get into power, and so to possess themselves of the Estates and Fortunes of their more opulent Neighbours.'[187] With this image of the wars' origin it was arguably easy to understand that the controversies stirred up by the Whigs over the succession of the Catholic duke of York, ostensibly over fears of the threat of popery and arbitrary government, were another sign of similar designs. It was also evident from Dugdale's historical parallelism that he perceived Covenanters and Presbyterians as types of French Leaguers, viewing their actions as recapitulating an older narrative of rebellion under the pretence of enhancing public piety. In England, as in France, palaces were plundered, authority was usurped, foreign assistance sought out, war against the king preached, and a new great seal struck. In short, the names had changed but the principles and hypocrisy were the same.[188] This applied typology, also evident in L'Estrange, Lovell, Dryden, and Nalson, had a mnemonic intent.[189] Dugdale wanted his *Short view* to become the image of the past through which readers would perceive parallels in present public affairs, and subsequently take the necessary action to engineer a different future—shut up the mouths of Charles II and the critics of his heir.

---

[186] Dugdale, *Short view*, 227-8; he argued that the Presbyterians were as much at fault for the regicide as Independents, since it was the former 'who originally put themselves in arms' to wage war against the king;'375-8.This charge was made just after the king's trial in Milton's *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649); see the modern version from the *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* edited by Martin Dzelzainis, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 191-7.

[187] Roper, 'Drawing Parallels,' 40-5; Dugdale, *Short view*, sig. A2.

[188] Dugdale, 600-650 on the Holy League.

Memorable Views

The preceding analysis of civil war histories published from 1680 to 1685 highlighted their representational features, that is, their aim to create memorable images of the past in order to guide perceptions of the present. By re-printing his twenty year old history Roger L'Estrange recast the present political debates over the succession into an earlier explanatory mould about the seditious aims of the government's critics. John Dryden and Archibald Lovell translated for a wider readership the old, true story of the civil wars, to demonstrate its usefulness for understanding the present. The collections of primary documents from the troubles assembled by Rushworth, Nalson, and Frankland were records by which readers could and should appreciate the similarities facing politicians and the public in the early 1680s with those of their ancestors in the Long Parliament. Edward Phillip's edition of Baker's *Chronicle* was condensed and re-issued by three anonymous editors to present an authoritative and oppositional interpretation of the wars the reason a reader ought to fear a future without a sitting Parliament. The memoirs and histories published by Anglesey, May, and Dugdale employed explanatory narratives about the causes and consequences of Parliament's resistance to Charles I that vindicated and condemned current political and religious outlooks, understood by the latter two authors to be present figures of historical types of rebels.

---

[189] On typology as 'memory work' see Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 93.

This analytical survey of historical works published during the early 1680s, a particular period of political crisis and reaction, as memorable representations sheds light on the author's historical consciousness, that is, the way the past was remembered through their works in order to help readers make sense of the present and act intentionally in the future.[190] The predominance of typological-exemplary perceptions of the civil war past is notable both in Whig and in Tory civil war histories.[191] For these historians England's particular troubles exemplified general principles or 'the truth', both political and moral, about such civil upheavals, whether forty or four years earlier.[192] Indeed, the hysteria surrounding the popish plot and the Whigs' attempts to exclude the duke of York by inflaming fears of popery simply re-affirmed the veracity of the antecedent explanations.[193] The perception that the early 1680s were a 'repeat screening' of the early 1640s was therefore one which historical writers purposefully projected to the public through their re-presentations of earlier narratives about and traces from the troubles.[194] The partisan divisions of the 1680s were in fact not the same as the 1640s, as contemporaries pointed out,[195] yet Tory authors such as L'Estrange, Nalson, May, and Dugdale, wilfully recapitulated stories and figures from older royalist historians as the key for making sense of the present and altering the course of the future.[196] At least one Whig polemicist reminded readers that these Tory re-presentations breached the Act of Indemnity's enjoinder not to revive 'any Name or Names, or other words of Reproach any way tending to revive the Memory of the late Differences.'[197] It was possible, however, to read Rushworth, Crouch or Whitelocke and see Laud's descendants holding up the exclusion bills in the House of Lords, or the dangers to the commonwealth which a long absence of Parliament posed, or perhaps to find hope in the eventual downfall of the Tory-Anglican hegemony. Thus the histories we have considered were not so much drawing upon what Jonathan Scott calls public memory, as seeking to re-shape it through their own memorable representation of the broken past.[198]

---

[190] 'History is the mirror of past actuality into which the present peers in order to learn something about its future,' Rüsen, *History*, 24-5. For examples of English people interpreting the present through the 'dark glass' of past experience, see Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 243-4.

[191] Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 126; Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 23-5.

[192] Rusen, *History*, 13-4; Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, 33-7.

[193] Mark Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 356; Tapsell, 'Politics and Political Discourse,' 241-4. Hartman argued in his 'Contemporary Explanations' that the essential explanations for the breach were set by Parliament's Grand Remonstrance of October 1641 and the king's various printed replied: both sides justified their actions as a defence of law and liberty against usurpers, 10-33.

[194] Here I am disagreeing with Scott's general *oeuvre*, as exemplified in *England's Troubles*, 20-43. For Anglican writings whose authors claimed that the opposition's call for ecclesiastical reformation masked a will to power see Gary De Krey, 'Reformation in the Restoration Crisis, 1679-1682' in Donna B. Hamilton

Furthermore, the histories analysed in this chapter pictured the nation's turbulent past through three memorable views that either confirmed or challenged the political convictions of their readers.[199] The first story emphasised the continuity between the

---

and Richard Strier (eds.), *Religion, Literature and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 245-8.

[195] *The Character of a Thorough Pac'd Tory*, 3.

[196] Miller, *After the Civil Wars*, 257. On the tendency among early modern historians to believe that the past determined the future see Reinhart Koselleck's 'Historiae Magistra Vitae' in *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Translated by Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 37-9.

[197] John Phillips, *New News from Toryland and Tantivyshire* (London: 1681, Wing P2095), 3.

[198] As John Watkins notes, the Tories shifted the locus of conflict from the legacy of Elizabeth I's struggle against popery, to the present implications of the 1640s; *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 133.

[199] David Carr, *Time, Narrative and History* (Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press, 1986), 48-55. The civil wars were not the only subject of controversy within English historical writing during this period; see J. G. A. Pocock, 'Robert Brady, 1627-1700. A Cambridge Historian of the Restoration' *Cambridge Historical Review* 10 (1951), 186-204; *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 182-228; Hicks, *Neo-classical History*, 83-98; and David L. Wykes, 'Dissenters and the Writing of History: Ralph Thoresby's "Lives and Characters"' in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 174-88.

principles, practices, and parties that had caused the civil wars, and those of the king's present opposition. This was a Tory view presented by L'Estrange's *Memento*, Lovell's and Dryden's translations, Nalson's and Frankland's collections, May's *Arbitrary government* and Dugdale's *Short view*. The picture of the wars drawn by these writers recapitulated earlier general explanations that blamed their outbreak on seditious groups with hypocritical claims to piety and concern for the commonwealth, who had been lately active once again. This was the explanatory narrative underlying the cry that ''41 is come again,' and which could justify present repressive policies designed to ensure that the future would be trouble free, such as the repression of Dissenters and the absence of Parliament for the time being.[200] It was in the government's interest to foster such memories of the wars and those responsible for their outbreak, particularly as the prospect of a Catholic successor loomed nearer. That James II was generally welcomed in 1685 as a defender of the ancient constitution and established church could thus be understood as the typological fulfilment of the Tory view of England's recent history—the story of hypocritical fears of popery in state and church during the 1640s, the historical type, had ensured the peaceful accession of a Catholic king, its future anti-type, upholding the law and established religion.[201]

The second narrative conveyed by histories published during these years highlighted the potential continuity between the absence of Parliaments and the danger of popery and arbitrary government, suggesting that the Stuarts could not be trusted to uphold the law and true religion. This story had not been widely published after 1660, when the concern for consensus, and later government censorship, had driven it largely underground; the lapse of the Licensing act had allowed it to be presented publicly again, if only briefly.[202] It also reiterated earlier accounts of malignant counsellors and meddling clerics, and of an imbalance between royal prerogative and Parliamentary privilege, and could be employed in calls for the return of the supreme legislature and a more Erastian church settlement. This was the perspective of the abridgements of Baker's *Chronicle*, Rushworth's collection and record of Strafford's trial, and Duke's *Multum*; by the end of the Oxford Parliament in 1681 it had become a Whig view of history.

---

[200] Knights, 'Tory Interpretation of History,' 356-8.
[201] Harris, *Revolutions*, 41-9.

The third story concerned the transitory nature of perceptions of the civil war past: Rushworth's *Tryal* and Whitelocke's *Memorials* highlighted the contingency of historical explanations and public affairs. The near unanimous denunciations of Charles I's personal rule in the opening of the Long Parliament, and its impeachment and attainder of Strafford, had at one time been judged crucial to the safety of the nation. Subsequent events, particularly the regicide and Restoration, induced many later historians to deride these judgments or to consign them to oblivion. Nonetheless, the fact that this had occurred suggested that posterity might some day vindicate what was now condemned. These were histories that counselled the public, or at least that portion of the public with Whig sympathies, to wait on events. For example, the impeachment of Strafford, and perhaps also the Whigs' attempts to exclude the duke of York, could one day be judged worthy efforts. The emphasis on the mutability of politics in *Memorials* implied that those who were politically ascendant at present, the Tory-Anglicans, could one day suffer as great a fall as had the Rump Parliament in 1653. It was this emphasis on waiting that compelled more radical Whigs in 1683, and again in 1689, to justify their resistance to Stuart absolutism using arguments from natural law.[203]

---

[202] Paulina Kewes, "Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law and National Memory in Early Restoration England" in Lorna Clymer (ed.) *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 119; and Keeble, *Restoration*, 68-77.

James II acceded to the throne peacefully in 1685. Remarkably, just under four years later he was once again living in exile in France, having lost his crown to his daughter Mary and son-in-law William of Orange. The constitutional and political consequences of what was soon called the Glorious Revolution altered the national political landscape and the wider context in which the civil wars were henceforth to be remembered; the transformations wrought by the Revolution and its constitutional settlement fostered new reasons for recalling the late troubled times. The next chapter will show how under these new circumstances England's civil war past was remembered in historical writing to vindicate or to denounce the changes wrought by the Revolution, and to identify the groups and principles which did and would pose the greatest danger to the public.

---

[203] Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, 189-90, 300-325.

VI.

Vindicators of Memory: civil war histories and the struggle for posterity in an age of parties, 1696-1705

This chapter examines historical writings about the civil wars which were published in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 and the end of pre-publication censorship in 1695, events which transformed the national context of remembering the troubled times. The works to be examined were purposeful interventions in the expanding arena of political debate that aimed to reshape their readers' historical memory, as well as endeavouring either to uphold or to criticise the post-Revolution polity. Historical writings about the troubles during this period also linked the question of historical guilt to the identity of the greatest present danger threatening the public; as such they were testaments to the power of the ruptured past, increasingly lost to personal memory, to divide English people's approach to contemporary national problems, and the utility of remembering the late troubles to advance partisan positions within an expanding political arena of public participation and debate.

*

Sometime between November 1675 and February 1677 Sir Philip Warwick wrote a history of public affairs from the accession of Charles I to the restoration of Charles II.[1] Sir Philip was by then an old Cavalier; as a member of the Long Parliament he first came to prominence in 1641 as one of the 'Straffordians' who voted against the earl's attainder.[2] It appeared that Warwick's general intention was for his book to be read as a history in the classical sense, that is, as a story of high politics that would guide both the prince and the people on how best to maintain security and peace.[3] In the process of remembering and writing about those turbulent years, however, Warwick had evidently found himself encountering particular memories which did not necessarily advance his larger purpose. For example, while discussing the Newport treaty Warwick remembered hearing that the king responded to the pressure of the negotiations by writing Latin verses; such images, Warwick wrote, 'were the most materiall things my memory will serve me to recollect' from those difficult days, 'and God knows, I never intended to write an History or Observations upon it.'[4] When the time came a quarter of a century later to publish Warwick's text, the promoters were in no doubt as to its aim and import, which was 'the Vindicating of the Cause and Actions of His Royal Master and His Friends, and to do right to Truth so to rectifie mistakes, and rescue the Memory of that Injur'd Prince from the false Imputations and Indignities that have been cast upon Him by Prejudiced and Malicious Men.'[5]

---

[1] Philip Warwick, *Memoires of the reigne of King Charles I. With a continuation to the happy restauration of King Charles II. By Sir Philip Warwick, Knight. Published from the original manuscript. With an alphabetical table* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1701).

Most of the scholarship on English historical writing in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries has highlighted its present-centredness and its partisanship. The medieval past was studied for the answers it purportedly gave to contemporary constitutional and ecclesiastical controversies.[6] Similarly, civil war history, according to Roger Richardson, took on an increasingly present political purpose during this period.[7] Patricia Springborg has coined the term 'political surrogacy' to describe the fact that works purporting to deal with civil war events and characters were really about contemporary issues.[8] In particular, the connection between debates over the significance of the execution of Charles I and Whig and Tory interpretations of the Glorious Revolution have been studied by George Watson and J. P. Kenyon.[9] The most notable demonstration of the predominant influence of post-Revolution political events on civil war history has been Blair Worden's analysis of Edmund Ludlow's manuscript entitled 'A voyce from the Watchtower.'[10] Worden argued convincingly that John Toland and John Darby systematically excised the eschatological imagery of Ludlow's 'Voyce' in order to publish it in 1698 as a memoir which would make republicanism attractive to the 'country party.'[11] Partially following Worden's lead, scholars interested in the origins of the English Enlightenment have highlighted the secularization of Whig historiography,[12] although work by Anthony Claydon has demonstrated the enduring importance of providence for Whig understandings of the Glorious Revolution, and Mark Knights has pointed out the similar approaches of Whig and Tory historians.[13] The late Joseph Levine made a related case for the continuity of historical method across partisan lines, arguing that advocates of the 'Ancients' and the 'Moderns' in the 'battle of the books' consciously imitated their Renaissance humanist forerunners.[14] Shifting the focus of analysis from the content of printed histories to the forms and processes by which historical knowledge circulated in English society, Daniel Woolf has expanded our understanding of the non-political uses to which conversations and books about the past were put by 1700.[15] Nonetheless, recent articles by John Seed and Mark Knights have re-emphasised the link between historical writing and politics, although both authors have presented more nuanced arguments about the connection between conflicting versions of the past and contemporary political and confessional identities.[16]

---

[2] Subsequently he fought for the king at Edgehill, helped to negotiate the surrender of the royalist capital Oxford, and attended Charles I during the Newport negotiations in 1648. Warwick was elected to the 'Cavalier Parliament' in 1661, and was active in shaping the statutes which restricted the worship of Protestant Nonconformists, known later as the Clarendon Code; David L. Smith, 'Warwick, Sir Philip (1609-1683),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28800, accessed 24 Jan 2008].

[3] Warwick, *Memoires*, 403-403, 188-9); Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), 9-10.

[4] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 328.

[5] 'Preface' to Warwick, *Memoirs*, Sig. A3r.

---

[6] For an older survey of the politics of Stuart medievalism see David C. Douglas, *English Scholars, 1660-1730* (London: Eyre and Spottishwoode, 1951); a more recent and focused study is available from Julia Rudolph, *Revolution by degrees: James Tyrrell and Whig political thought in the late seventeenth century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), 72-91.

[7] Roger Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* Third Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 42-3. According to Laird Okie, 'the nature of historical writing in the first two decades of the eighteenth century cannot be understood without appreciating the charged political climate in which they were written,' *Augustan Historical Writing: Histories of England in the English Enlightenment* (Lanham, MY: University Press of America), 18. Royce MacGillivray's insightful survey of seventeenth century civil war historians suffers from his decision to examine together works evincing the same ideological perspective, which means histories written or published around the same time are not compared, the exception being his chapter on Rushworth and Nalson; *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), 98-119.

[8] Patricia Springborg, *Mary Astell: Theorist of Freedom from Domination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 147.

[9] G. Watson, 'The Augustan Civil War' *Review of English Studies* 36 (1985), 321-37, and J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: the politics of party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 65-79. See also John Marshall, 'Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 524.

[10] A. B. Worden, (ed.), Edmund Ludlow, *A Voice from the Watchtower: Part Five: 1660-1662* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978).

[11] Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow Esq... in two volumes....*, ([Vevay,] Switzerland: 1698). Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London:

Historical writing was a form of public remembering constrained by its present political context; stories about the past, whether put abroad orally or written and printed

---

Penguin, 2002), 37-114; but c.f. Justin Champion, *Republican learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 94-6.

[12] Okie, *Augustan historical writing*, 4, 17; Melinda Zook, 'Restoration Remembered: the first Whigs and the making of their history' *Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002), 213-34; Blair Worden, 'The question of secularization' in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus (eds.) *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 20-40.

[13] Anthony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 100-105; Mark Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 347-66.

[14] Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: The Origins of Modern English Historiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 155-162; c.f. Hicks, *Neoclassical History*, 99-108.

[15] Daniel Woolf, 'Speaking of history: conversations about the past in Restoration England' in Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 119-133; see also his *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 79-131 and 166-254.

[16] John Seed, 'History and Narrative Identity: Religious Dissent and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 46-63; Knights, 'Tory Interpretation of History.'

as history, were socially constructed and designed to be relevant to contemporary life.[17] This chapter provides a qualitative analysis of a diverse sample of civil war histories that told the stories of the late troubles in the aftermath of three significant political and demographic transformations to the national political context: the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89,[18] the explosion of printed partisan discourse following the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695,[19] and the passing away of the generation that had participated actively in the troubles. First-hand oral testimony about the wars and Interregnum period, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, was very difficult to find by 1705; by that date, and thereafter, English women and men had to rely upon second-hand accounts, and written or printed stories, to learn about the previous century's upheavals. The chapter concludes in 1705 partly for reasons of space, and partly from the conviction that the first three years of Queen Anne's reign provide an adequate sample of civil war historical writing during 'the first age of parties.'[20]

The civil war histories examined below, like the testimonies of the defaulting accountants and maimed veterans, and works published in the 1660s and early 1680s, were also purposeful interventions into the national public arena which aimed to reshape the historical consciousness of their readers in relation to present affairs, and endeavoured to alter the ways the wars would be remembered now and in the future. I use the descriptor 'national public arena' first, because of the histories' focus on England's public institutions,[21] second, because by being printed they were made to appear 'in the face of all Men,'[22] and third, because the public as rhetorical community composed of the whole people was increasingly called upon after the Glorious Revolution to arbitrate matters of national interest.[23] By historical consciousness I mean the way people remember their past in order to make sense of the present and to act intentionally thereafter.[24] Historical writing about the wars in the decade after the end of pre-publication censorship increasingly took the form of public acts of blaming and exonerating as part of a public struggle to identify those whose guilt for past wrongs made them the greatest present danger to the nation. These publications demonstrate the continuing power of stories about the ruptured past, increasingly lost to personal memory, to divide English people's thinking about political problems in a national context much transformed from 1660, and the polemical utility of remembering the late troubles to advance partisan positions within an expanding political arena of public participation and debate.

---

[17] J. R. Jones's *Country and Court: England 1658-1714* (London: Edward Arnold, 1978), 255-330 contains a helpful survey of political developments after the Glorious Revolution.

[18] See Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Allen Lane, 2006) for a lucid analysis of the fall of James II and the political settlement of 1689; also Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution: Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 4-62, and Tony Claydon, *William III* (London: Longman, 2002), 7-50.

[19] Raymond Astbury, 'The Renewal of the Licensing Act in 1693 and its Lapse in 1695,' *The Library, Fifth Series* 33 (1978), 296-322; on the evolution of print culture in the absence of censorship see Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 223-38.

[20] Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* Revised Edition, (London: Hambledon, 1987), xiii; William A. Speck, *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation, 1700-1710* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994); Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 282-5.

Revolutionary Vindications

---

[21] Daniel Woolf, 'Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past' in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer (eds.) *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-cultural approaches to Historiography, Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 71-103.

[22] Edward Phillips, *The new world of words: or, A universal English dictionary* (London: R. Bentley, 1696). Phillips, a nephew to John Milton, was also the editor of the Restoration-era editions of Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle of the Kings of England*.

[23] Geoff Baldwin, 'The "public" as a rhetorical community in early modern England' in Alexandra Walsham and Phil Withington (eds.) *Communities in Erly Mdern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 203; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 94-99, and 'History and Literature in the Age of Defoe and Swift' *History Compass* 3 (2005), 4-5; Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002), but c.f. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (April 2006), 273-292.

[24] Jörn Rüsen, *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), 24-5.

This section compares historical writings which attacked the royalist cause and the Stuart dynasty to justify the preservation of the political and constitutional changes wrought by the Glorious Revolution, or to call for further transformations of the political and religious landscape.

The political transformation of Britain and Ireland set in motion by William of Orange's invasion of England in November 1688 and the flight of King James II the following month was recognized by contemporaries as revolutionary.[25] Nevertheless, the Revolution, and the political settlement which gave it retrospective legitimacy in England, was justified according to legal, philosophical, theological, and historical principles which made it acceptable to the majority of the nation, albeit in different ways, in contrast to the creation of the republic in 1649.[26] The minority which remained loyal to James II expressed their disapproval of, or hostility towards, the new regime with varying degrees of intensity. Early in the 1690s over four hundred clergy were ejected from their livings for refusing to swear allegiance to William and Mary, and subsequently spent the rest of their days as relatively peaceful, if not reticent, sufferers for the principle of hereditary succession.[27] The revelation of a conspiracy to assassinate William III in Richmond Park in early 1696, however, demonstrated the continuing danger of a Jacobite restoration, and the threat such an eventuality posed to the Revolution settlement.[28] In the four years following the 'Barclay plot' the national past was marshalled by John Seller, Roger Coke, David Jones, and John Toland, into stories that defended the status quo by narrating, moderately or intemperately, the Stuart dynasty's, or its particular members', political faults.[29]

---

[25] Tim Harris, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 508.

[26] Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1688 and the Structure of Political Argument' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1983), 513-19; Claydon, *William III*, 51-69; Rudolph, *Revolution by degrees*, 69; Warren Johnston, 'Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-89' *Historical Journal* 48 (2005), 351-89; Harris, *Revolution*, 485-90.

[27] G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: TheCareer of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 10-16; William Gibson, *The Church of England, 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001); John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714* (Harlow: Longman, 2006), 193-234.

Seller's *The History of England* was the only vindication of the Revolution which attempted to tell the nation's whole story. Seller declared that this text would allow readers of the 'meanest Capacity,' including children, servants, masters and mistresses, to render a tolerable account of two thousand years of history. In order to aid his reader's retention of the national narrative, Seller issued the work one sheet at a time (at a cost of one penny per sheet), arguing that thereby its sections would leave 'a stronger Impression on the Memory.'[30] The book was organized by the regnal dates of England's monarchs, thus the civil wars and Interregnum appeared as part of the stories of Charles I and Charles II.

The second Stuart king was portrayed as a good man with the ultimately disastrous tendency to heed the advice of bad ministers. For example, the major counterfactual of Charles I's reign posed by Seller related to the king's reliance on Buckingham in the 1620s, and Laud in the 1630s; had he not, he would not have suffered the unprecedented fate of being executed 'by his own subjects.'[31] Seller recounted the story of the king's relations with the Long Parliament up to the attempt on the five members in January 1642, but then jumped back chronologically to discuss the outbreak of the Irish revolt the previous October. Evidently he believed that the furore associated with the former event was causally connected to the fears generated by the latter. Charles had left Westminster when his declarations refuting the purported link between the Court and the Irish rebellion, and in defence of his Queen, did him little good in the eyes of Parliament.[32]

---

[28] Jones, *Court and Country*, 274-5; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 50; Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), 169-70.

[29] Unlike MacGillivray in *Restoration Historians*, 168-9, I am not treating these works as 'Whig histories' because Tories were also able to justify the Revolution of 1688, although in ways that often infuriated their opponents; Goldie, '1688 and Political Argument,' 513-16; John Morrill, 'The sensible revolution' in Jonathan Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 73-104; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 63-92; Claydon, *William III*, 60-69.

[30] John Seller, *The History of England. Giving a True and Impartial Account of the most Considerable Transactions in Church and State, in Peace and War, during the Reigns of all the Kings and Queens*...(London: John Gwillim, 1696), Sig. A2v. It appeared from the history's frontispiece that Seller wanted the events of seven years prior to leave the greatest mark on his reader's memory, since at its centre was a portrait of William III surrounded by ethnic figures from the past: a Roman, a Britain, a Saxon, a Norman, and a Dane. The impression left by this image was that the current king was both the focalizing lens through which readers were to look back upon their nation's story, and standpoint from which they were to retell it to others.

The immediate cause of the king's execution was explained by Seller without recourse to providence or religious divisions among the Parliamentarians; it was simply the self-interest of army officers which drove the regicide and erection of the republic. The underlying reason for Charles's downfall, however, were his previous attempts to govern absolutely, for 'never any Prince fell out with his Parliament, and went about to establish an Arbitrary Power, but he not only found himself Mistaken, but also thereby made himself Miserable.'[33] For Seller, the tendency towards absolutism was the most memorable reason for the unprecedented execution of Charles I. Viewed through the lens of 1688-89 the regicide was less a visitation of inscrutable providence upon the nation for its sin, and more the tragic consequence of good man whose kingship brought disharmony to the constitution; all the more reason it would seem to rejoice now at the balanced government exercised by William III.

---

[31] Seller, *History of England*, 601-2.
[32] Seller, *History of England*, 594.
[33] Seller, *History of England*, 600, 602.

The disruptive nature of the Stuart dynasty to England's story was brought out even more strongly in the second edition of the political economist Roger Coke's historical refutation of the Jacobite cause, *The detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns*, re-published in 1696 three years after its initial release.[34] Coke's narrative vindicated the Revolution by tracing the Stuart family's penchant for making their will into law, leading invariably to what he called 'a divided Dominion,' or, somewhat confusingly, a 'divided will' in the prince. England's civil wars were the consequence of ambitious factions which Coke claimed were given life by Charles I's divided will, although James I in Coke's judgment was hardly a model adherent of England's laws and constitutions.[35] He characterized the second Stuart's dealings with Parliament during the 1620s, and his personal rule during the 1630s, as 'Perfectly French' and unprecedented in England's history, which consequently 'brought on a miserable War…and destruction upon the King.'[36] The personal rule of Charles I was for Coke a kind of tyranny from which the Long Parliament delivered the nation; 'if it had not, God only knows where it would have ended.'[37] Likewise, if the Prince of Orange had not put a stop to James II 'the popish superstition, and French Tyranny, would have been imposed upon these kingdoms' and spread over the whole of Europe.[38]

Although Coke believed the policies of Charles I bore the largest responsibility for creating a context in which civil war was probable, the actual descent into violence was triggered by an over-reaching Parliamentary faction.[39] Things were tending towards peace and harmony when the Faction ratcheted up the political temperature in late 1641 through its propaganda and orchestrated popular protests.[40] While admitting that Charles erred in entering the Commons' chamber to arrest five members, Coke condemned Parliament for not accepting the king's subsequent retraction and for attempting to disrupt the balance of the constitution by 'tearing' the militia from him.[41] Coke thus judged, if not whole-heartedly, that the royalists had the law and the constitution on their side, even though the king's commitment to the fundamental law was suspect. Indeed, several old Cavaliers had often told Coke that 'they as much dreaded the Kings overcoming the Parliament Party, as they feared to be overcome by them.'[42]

---

[34] Roger Coke, *The detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns, and the Inter-regnum. The Second Edition corrected. To which are added many other secrets, never before made publick: as also, a more impartial account of the Civil Wars in England, than has yet been given* (London: 1696). John Callow, 'Coke, Roger (c.1628-1704x7),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5829, accessed 24 Jan 2008].

[35] Coke, *Court and State*, sig. A3r; Book I, 6, 130, 133-4.

[36] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 72-3, 1.

[37] Coke, *Court and State* Book II, 43 and 54.

[38] Coke, *Court and State*, Book IV, 42.

Coke evidently understood himself to be engaged in a textual dialogue with the work of earlier historians including Battista Nani,[43] John Hacket,[44] and Bulstrode Whitelocke.[45] Coke also at times engaged in debate with primary texts (and their collectors); after summarizing Charles I's speech justifying his dissolution of Parliament in 1628 Coke despaired that the king had not bothered to 'answer or deny any one' of the items of Parliament's remonstrance.[46] Coke's most extensive conversation was with Thomas May's *Causes and Beginnings of the Civil Wars*, which Coke attacked in order to vindicate his own exoneration of Charles I.[47] He argued that the use of the mob by Pym and his allies was as much a breach of Parliamentary privilege as the king's attempt to arrest the five members. Parliament's subsequent demand for control over the militia, while reserving the right to determine the time of its own dissolution, was as much an overthrow of the ancient constitution as the king's personal rule, for, Coke contended, 'the Parliament being perpetual, and having the power of the Militia, the Government must [have been] either a Commonwealth, or an Oligarchy.'[48] Coke regretted that May had allowed 'the Distempers of a Distracted Time' and his prejudices, rather than the truth, to be 'the measures of his Story.'[49]

---

[39] The classic modern exponent of a three-tiered model of civil war causation—longer, medium, and short-term—is Lawrence Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-42* (London: Routlegde and Kegan Paul, 1972).

[40] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 132-33.

[41] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 134.

[42] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 153, 133.

[43] Battista Nani, *The history of the affairs of Europe in this present age, but more particularly of the republick of Venice. VVritten in Italian by Battista Nani Cavalier and procurator of St Mark. Englished by Sir Robert Honywood, Knight* (London: printed by J[ohn]. M[acock]. for John Starkey, 1672), Coke, *Court and State*, sig. A4r.

[44] John Hacket, *Scrinia reserata*: *Life of the Lord Keeper* or *Life of Bishop Williams* (London: 1693), Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 5, 26.

[45] Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682), Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 91.

[46] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 72-3.

The strategy of distributing the blame for the civil wars between both King Charles and the Parliament arguably was of a piece with Coke's self-presentation as an impartial historian, one whose 'Story of the Present Age' stood firm, as his ancestors had before and during the troubles, 'to the Laws and Liberties of the Nation.' Condemning the constitutional excesses of Charles I's government might well have enraged both Jacobites and some 'high Tories,' while charging the Long Parliament with setting up arbitrary rule in 1642 was certain to upset many, if not most, of Coke's Whig readers.[50] Coke thus portrayed himself as the historian of the moderate middle by identifying as extreme the principles of his opponents, and by the distribution of culpability in his narrative. It is evident that for Coke the summer of 1641 represented a brief moment of constitutional balance in the story of the Stuart dynasty—a failed Restoration—which was then undone by a tyrannical Parliament, much like James II's tyranny had overturned the settlement of 1660.[51] At its heart then, Coke's story of the civil wars was that of a reluctant (constitutional?) royalist, dismayed at the fact that 'these last four kings of the Scottish race, which should have been the Guardians of England, in preserving the Laws and Constitutions of it, and to have maintained the Honour of it abroad, made it their business to have subverted them.'[52] Yet, in light of all that William III had done to restore the nation, the English public should desire the return of James II no more 'than the Primitive Christians did Diocletian, Maxentius, after God had freed them from their Rage and Persecution by Constantine.'[53]

---

[47] Thomas May, *A breviary of the history of the Parliament of England... I. The causes and beginning of the Civil War of England...* (London: Rob. White, 1650); Coke, *Court and State*, 138-51.

[48] Coke, *Court and State*, 148-150.

[49] Coke, *Court and State*, 141-2; he cites Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 276.

[50] Indeed, Coke declared that he had no doubt that his history would displease two parties, those who exalted the 'divided will of the Prince above his Royal Capacity,' and those 'which are impatient under Regal Government;' *Court and State*, sig. A5r-A6r. The mention of ancestors was no doubt in reference to his famous paternal grandfather, the legal historian, chief justice, and politician Sir Edward Coke (1552-1634). On the elder Coke's legal historiography as exemplary of the 'common-law mind' see J. G. A. Pocock's *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (New York: Norton, 1967), 30-69.

The year after Coke's *Detection* was published his friend David Jones borrowed large sections of it for his own 'tragical history' of the Stuart dynasty, which was issued together with a continuation of his 'secret history' of English foreign policy under Charles II.'[54] Annabel Patterson defines 'secret history' as the genre which made public what official history suppressed, thereby uncovering the 'true' course of national affairs.[55] This particular work contained letters revealing the king to be a client of Louis XIV, thus confirming publicly a link between the Stuarts and the French interest.[56] For Jones, unlike Coke, the Stuart's policy errors while kings of England needed to be understood within the longer unhappy story of their tenure as kings and queens of Scotland. The Scottish portion of the family's history took up around three-quarters of the Stuart's tragic tale, of which the greatest portion (one-third) was devoted to the events leading up to the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1586.[57] This emphasis on Mary's fall seems hardly accidental, for the particularly tragic quality of the dynasty that Jones highlighted throughout the work was the violence (or unnaturalness) of their deaths; other than Robert II (the first Stuart king of Scotland) and Mary wife of William III, all Stuart monarchs had met violent ends; according to Jones both James I and Charles II were probably poisoned.[58]

---

[51] Coke, *Court and State*, Book II, 132; on the quest for a settlement after the first civil war as a kind of 'restoration process' see David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), 130-33; c.f. Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 389-90. Tim Harris argues that the Restoration settlement in England was a deliberate turning-back of the constitutional clock to 1641; *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Penguin/Allen Lane, 2005), 134-5.

[52] Coke, *Court and State*, Book IV, 42. On 'constitutional royalists' prior to the civil wars see David L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 62-106, but c.f. Paul Seaward 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism' *Historical Journal* 40 (1997), 227-39.

[53] Coke, *Court and State*, Book IV, 42.

[54] David Jones, *A Continuation of the Secret History of White-Hall; ...Together with the Tragical History of the Stuarts, from the first Rise of that Family* (London: R. Baldwin,1697). Jones was an inveterate 'recycler' of other people's work according to Henry Leonard Snyder, 'David Jones, Augustan historian and pioneer English annalist' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 44 (1980), 23.

Jones did not think that the Stuarts as English kings were simply the victims of trans-generational bad luck. He claimed that James I's and Charles I's 'Male-Administration' of England, particularly their difficulty governing in harmony with their Parliaments, made Queen Elizabeth's reign look better in hindsight than it really was.[59] Charles I's high-handedness, 'riding the Nation for fifteen years' and imposing a prayer book on the Scots, was 'the foundation of those dreadful Wars and of the King's subsequent destiny.' The accent in the 'tragical history' on the family's propensity for unnatural endings, coupled with the reminder in Jones's summary of Justice Bradshaw's final speech to Charles I of past examples of people punishing their kings, 'especially out of Scotland,' could be read as an interpretation of the regicide as simply one more instance of the popular retribution for bad government, albeit in an unprecedented manner.[60] Like his maternal grandmother Queen Mary, Charles I was executed; unlike his ancestor, however, his son left him no lasting monument.[61]

---

[55] Annabel Patterson, *Early Modern Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 185-7, 192. She thinks Jones's precursors included Sir William Temple's 'memoirs,' an anonymous *Secret History of the Four last Monarchs* (1691) and Andrew Marvell's *An Account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government in England* (Amsterdam: 1677);

[56] Alexander Du Toit, 'Jones, David (fl. 1675-1720),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14988, accessed 24 Jan 2008]. Jones ostensibly had collected them while acting as an English spy in France.

[57] Jones, *Secret History*, 140-246.

[58] Jones, *Secret History*, 322-5; 382-3; Jones claimed Charles II was assassinated in 1685 just before he was about to recall Parliament.

[59] Jones, *Secret History*, 317, 328-9, 377, 292; Jones thus offers further evidence for John Watkins' argument against the inevitability of nostalgia for the Virgin Queen after 1603; *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Jones's history of the Stuarts offered the truth about their remarkably unhappy deaths as an answer to men who argued that 'the Princes here spoken of, were the best, and most virtuous in their Lives.'[62] While not specifically invoking providence, the pattern of so many tragic ends could easily be interpreted as the verdict of divine justice. Down through the ages God himself had weighed the family in the cosmic balance and found its patriarchs and matriarchs culpable.[63] The fact that one of only two Stuarts who died in peace was the recently deceased wife of the 'present Lawful and Rightful Possessor of the Throne' was yet another vindication of the Glorious Revolution from God. Jones's dynastic history of memorable Stuart deaths thus complemented the providentialist propaganda of the William III's court, in which the king was heralded as the magistrate installed by God to protect the Protestant Church and bring moral reform to the land.[64]

---

[60] Jones, *Secret History*, 329; 348-9.

[61] Jones, *Secret History*, 354-5; on the memorials erected by James I to his mother and to Queen Elizabeth see Peter Sherlock, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 263-289.

[62] Jones, *Secret History*, sig. A8v. While Eva Bannet's argument that the primary documents reproduced in secret histories bolstered the genre's claim to tell more truths about the past than was possible in regular histories is sound, her related contention that this practice brought such works closer to modern historical writing ignores the importance of demonstrating the truth through reprinted texts in ecclesiastical histories such as Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*; Eva Tavor Bannet, '"Secret History": Or, Talebearing Inside and Outside the Secretorie' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 392.

[63] Edward Peyton's *The divine catastrophe of the kingly family of the house of Stuarts: or, A short history of the rise, reign, and ruine thereof....* (London: Giles Calvert, 1652) contained a similar providentialist reading of the dynasty's history from the mid-sixteenth century to the death of Charles I. I thank Daniel Woolf for this reference.

The closest thing to a court-sponsored national history to emerge after the Glorious Revolution, *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England for the Last Hundred Years* (1700), came from the pen of the former physician to Queen Mary and political journalist James Welwood.[65] The Stuarts' tenure as British kings was the work's general focus, but for Welwood the arrival of William and Mary and the downfall of James II loomed larger than any other national event of the previous five reigns, including the civil wars.[66] The overarching theme of Welwood's history was, like Rushworth's *Collections*, the long-standing contest between the subject's liberty and the royal prerogative.[67] England possessed an excellently balanced constitution, in which a limited and hereditary monarchy governed a free people. Nevertheless, the 'brittle state of human affairs' meant that despite the soundness of nation's fundamental law, 'scarce an Age [had] pass'd without some remarkable Struggle, either between King and People for Prerogative and Liberty, or between Competitors for the Crown it self.'[68] Welwood argued that the latter part of Elizabeth's reign was a model for good relations between crown and people, but her Stuart successors failed to achieve a similar constitutional balance, and indeed at times actively worked to upset it.[69] Welwood placed most of the blame for the mid-century troubles on James I, leaving his son a legacy of discontent and bad counsel which fatally undermined Charles I's administration.[70] Archbishop William Laud also came under harsh criticism for pushing Charles I towards excessive defences of the royal prerogative, and for provoking the Scots to rebel.[71] Following Whitelocke, Welwood argued that the king's attempt to arrest the five members was the fatal 'tipping point' in the relationship between Charles I and the Long Parliament, 'whoever they were that advis'd the King to this rash Attempt, are justly chargeable with all the Blood that was afterwards spilt.'[72] Although Welwood exculpated Charles I in his story of the origin of the civil wars, and highlighted his personal goodness, in his final assessment of the king's career he suggested that 'an Immoderate Desire of Power, beyond what the Constitution did allow of, was the Rock he split upon.'[73] Thus, whereas Coke had partially exonerated Charles I for bringing about the civil wars by attacking the unprecedented ambition of the parliamentary faction, Welwood for his part attempted to vindicate the Long Parliament by conceding the king's unbalanced yearnings for power.

---

[64] Jones, *Secret History*, sig. A8v; Claydon, *Godly Reformation*, 31-44, 100-105; and *William III*, 69. The king's death in early 1702 from injuries sustained from a riding accident could of course be interpreted as divine punishment by ardent Jacobites.

[65] James Welwood, *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England, for the Last Hundred Years, Preceding the Revolution of 1688* (London: Tim Goodwin, 1700). Elizabeth Lane Furdell, 'Welwood, James (1652-1727),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29023, accessed 24 Jan 2008].

[66] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 261-402. The reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, were narrated over ninety-eight pages, while the three years of James II's rule took up eighty-four pages. Furthermore, of the twenty-three appendices which reprinted 'original' documents or letters, eleven concerned events or reflections from 1685 to 1688. MacGillivray's brief assessment of the text as exemplifying the 'Whig spirit' is in *Restoration Historians*, 169-70.

[67] John Rushworth *Historical collections of private passages of state. Weighty matters in law. Remarkable proceedings in five Parliaments. Beginning the sixteenth year of King James, anno 1618. And ending the fifth year of King Charls, anno 1629* (London: Thomas Newcomb for George Thomason, 1659), sig. A3.

[68] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 3, 7.

Welwood's strategy of dividing the responsibility for the wars between the combatants ultimately yielded to an argument about the contingency of such weighty transactions. The Long Parliament was a 'great assembly' that was derailed from its good purpose 'by a Chain of concurring Accidents ripen'd for destruction.' On the other side, 'a continued Series of Misfortunes attended the Royal Cause; and several favourable

---

[69] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 18, 19, 87.
[70] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 37, 40.
[71] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 38-39, 41, 44, 61, 88.
[72] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 63, citing Whitelock, *Memorials*, 51.
[73] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 87.

Accidents that seem'd from time to time to promise better Events, did concur in the end to the King's undoing.' In the end Welwood decided that the question of who had caused the irreparable breach was simply unimportant; 'whatever side begun the War, it was carried on in the beginning with equal success.'[74] Whether unwittingly or not, Welwood's emphasis on the main protagonists' good will, their accidental descent into violence, and his unwillingness to identify positively which side was the initial aggressor, echoed the phrasing of Charles II's letter to the House of Commons in 1660, which spoke about the 'the mistakes and misunderstandings which have produced, and contributed, to inconveniences which were not intended.'[75] Welwood was clearly groping, like the king on the verge of his Restoration, for a consensual account of the civil wars' origin in which the question of blame was dropped. While this effort might have resulted from Welwood's desire to honour the sensibilities of his former patron Queen Mary towards her paternal grandfather, and to enhance his self-presentation as a writer 'for the sake of truth and not a particular faction,' it is also probable that he recognized that civil war histores that sought to determine the party responsible for their outbreak would invariably turn the centre of readers' remembrance of the seventeenth-century English history from the figure of James II, disagreeable to most of the public, towards the more divisive character of his father.[76]

---

[74] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, 45, 74, 66.

[75] Charles II, 'To our trusty and well-beloved the Speaker of the House of Commons,' cited in Paulina Kewes, 'Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law, and National Memory in Early Restoration England' in Lorna Clymer (ed.), *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures, 1650-1832* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 108.

[76] Welwood, *Material Transactions*, sig. A8v.

The Church of England continued to put the character of Charles I at the centrepiece of an annual Fast Day service on the anniversary, 30 January, of his death.[77] This commemoration prompted the final Revolutionary vindication to consider, an anonymous history now attributed to John Toland entitled *King Charles I. No such Saint, Martyr, or Good Protestant* (1698).[78] Toland, standing in the iconoclastic tradition of John Milton,[79] wanted to demolish the cult of the royal martyr, and the doctrine of *jure divino* kingship very often articulated by the clergy in Fast Day sermons commemorating the regicide.[80] He declared his hope that in the present readers would see how formerly the nation had in both a religious and a civil sense 'idoliz'd this King, and ador'd the Image and Memory of him, who hath offered at more cunning fetches to undermine the Liberties of England, and put Tyranny into an Art, than any British King before him.'[81] The idol of the saintly Stuart king was blasted in Toland's tract in three ways; first, through an articulation of the doctrine of popular sovereignty and the people's right of resistance, secondly, by a historical survey attacking the rule and religion of Charles I, and thirdly, by vindicating Parliament's resistance to him in 1642.[82] As evidence of the king's tyrannical oppressions Toland cited 'his raising, without Act of Parliament,

---

[77] Church of England, *A Form of Common Prayer to be used upon the thirtieth of January*... (London: John Bill, 1661). For a survey of the themes of 30th January sermons after 1690 see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 173-204.

[78] D.J. [John Toland], *King Charles I. No such Saint, Martyr, or Good Protestant as commonly reputed*... (London: 1698).

[79] John Milton *Eikonoklastēs in answer to a book intitl'd Eikōn basilikē, the portrature of his Sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings* (London: Matthew Simmons, 1649).

[80] For an analysis of the politics of anti-clericalism after 1660 see Justin Champion, '"Religion's safe, with priestcraft is the war": Augustan anti-clericalism and the legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 547-61, which recapitulates the argument of his *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). While Champion sees anti-clericalism as 'not simply a religious position' Mark Knights contends that by 1700 it had largely become a linguistic tool to hide or unmask sectarian interest; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 288.

[81] Toland, *King Charles I*, 2.

[82] The argument for popular sovereignty is at Toland, *King* Charles, 5-10, which Justin Champion reads as evidence of Toland's 'anticlerical republicanism;' *Republican Learning*, 94.

£200,000 on the poor Merchants for Ship-money, Coat and Conduct money.'[83] As examples of Charles I's impiety Toland mentioned the king's sponsorship of the anti-Sabbatarian Book of Sports in 1633, his 'marrying a violent Papist, his making Articles with France in favour of Papists,' his 'preferring many of them to places of eminent Trusts,' and finally, his correspondence with Catholic Irish Confederates.[84] Toland defended the Long Parliament by arguing that its actions were necessitated by the imminent danger 'of losing the Protestant Religion, their Laws, their Lives and Liberties....[for] was not the King a great favourer of Papists, and lover of Tyranny?' From 1625 until 1640 the reign of Charles I had been 'such a continued piece of Popish Tyranny and Oppression, that the people had risked life and property to deliver themselves and their posterity 'with the greatest cheerfulness.'[85]

The Fast Days for Charles I ought to cease, and the commemoration of the royal martyr terminated, Toland believed, for the sake of the truth about Christian martyrdom and the truth about the origin of the civil wars. King Charles had not died, Toland argued, 'for being a Witness or Confessor of the Revealed Truths in God's Word,' but 'for favouring Papists, and subverting in a most arbitrary manner all the Laws and Liberties of England.' The real reasons for the king's death were suppressed at countless anniversary services at which the Church's clergy told people 'lying Stories, and dangerous

---

[83] Toland, *King Charles I*, 13. Toland referred readers to another tract (also anonymously published by himself), *A Defence of the Parliament of 1640 etc.* (London: 1698, Wing T1765A) for more 'Instances of his Arbitrary and Illegal Government.'

[84] Toland, *King Charles I*, 10-11; the calamity of the king's marriage to Henrietta-Maria is re-emphasized at 15, 16-7, 19.

[85] Toland, *King Charles I*, 19-20. Toland made a longer case for Parliament's resistance in a tract called *A Defence of the Parliament* (1698). On Parliament's reluctance at the outbreak of hostilities to charge Charles I with tyranny see J. S. Morrill, 'Rhetoric and action: Charles I, tyranny, and the English revolution' in Gordon J. Schochet, P.E. Taspaugh, and Carol Brobeck (eds.), *Religion, Resistance, and Civil Wars: Papers Presented at the Folger Institute Seminar 'Political Thought in Early Modern England, 1600-1660'* (Washington: Proceedings of the Folger Institute Center for the History of British Political Thought, 1990), 91-113.

Notions.'[86] It was also imperative from a political standpoint to terminate the cult of King Charles, because observing 30th January as a day of humiliation and prayer provided Jacobites with a potent case against the Glorious Revolution; if the Long Parliament were rebels for resisting Charles I, 'how much more are they Rebels that against their own principles of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance, turned out their Jure Divino King, the late Tyrant James, who had not committed half so many arbitrary and illegal Actions' as his father was charged with?[87] If Charles I was innocent it was hard not to conclude that James II was also guiltless, and thus also done wrong by the nation.[88]

Toland's narrative made Charles I culpable for the civil wars and his own death, and drew the parallel between 1649 and 1688, to vindicate the Glorious Revolution as a legitimate act of popular resistance to a tyrant; his target was people who made the 'memory of 1649' the starting point for their condemnations of popular sovereignty, resistance theory, and interpretations of 1688-89 as anything but a providential deliverance.[89] *King Charles I* was a strident, and focussed, justification of the Post-Revolution political and constitutional status quo via an historical attack on the Stuarts. These works produced a series of counter-histories with different assessments of civil war guilt and innocence. Before turning to them, however, the chapter will briefly survey three personal vindications which Toland and his political patrons published to defend 'neo-Roman' thought and to attack their erstwhile Junto Whig allies.[90]

---

[86] Toland, *King Charles I*, 10, 26.
[87] Toland, *King Charles I*, 26.
[88] Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, 65, 77-79.
[89] Watson, 'Augustan civil war,' 326; Champion, *Republican learning*, 95; J. P. Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993), 32-5.
[90] Since the publication of Quentin Skinner's *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) the term 'neo-roman' is used as a synonym for early modern republican political thought; for example, Marshall, 'Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution,' 524.

Republican Vindications

The next group of civil war histories, a series of personal vindicatory narratives, were published because their exculpatory stories could be used to decry a perceived betrayal of the principles of the Glorious Revolution by King William and his Junto Whig allies.

Thanks to the detective work and insightful analysis of Blair Worden it is now evident that between 1697 and 1699 a series of civil war memoirs, and books written by republican theorists John Milton, James Harrington, and Algernon Sidney, were either published for the first time or re-published by a circle of radical Whigs, Toland among them, with the support of the third earl of Shaftesbury and Robert Harley.[91] Among the memoirs was the previously mentioned *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow*,[92] along with writings by Denzil Holles,[93] Sir Thomas Fairfax,[94] and Sir John Berkeley;[95] all of whom except Berkeley had been Parliamentarians during the 1640s. These publications bear signs of either substantial or slight editorial revision when compared with their antecedent manuscripts.[96] The timing of their release and the nature of the revisions, particularly in the case of Ludlow's *Memoirs*, led Worden to argue that these memoirs were an effort by radical Whigs, disgusted by what they perceived to be the betrayal of the Revolution by their erstwhile Junto Whig allies, Lords Somers, Halifax, Wharton, Orford and Sunderland, to synthesise republican political thought with country party sentiment in Parliament.[97] The 'new country party' of the later 1690s was a fluid coalition of Whigs and Tories led by Paul Foley and Robert Harley, brought together by the notion of parliamentary independence from the Court, opposition to the Junto Whig ministry, and hostility towards the king's plan to maintain a standing army despite the conclusion in 1697 of the war with France.[98] The country party campaign against William III's 'mercenary army' would be bolstered in part by cautionary memoirs of the New Model army's purge of Parliament, and Cromwell's rise to preeminent power.[99] While Worden has thus convincingly demonstrated how contemporary political issues shaped the creation of the radical Whig canon, the fact that the key historical image the memoirs' publishers hoped would be drawn from them—the danger of standing armies—was itself a product of the memoirists' agenda of self-exculpation, merits a brief reconsideration of the three lesser known personal histories.

---

[91] Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, 39, 86-87. The radical Whigs named by Worden include John Toland, John Trenchard, John Moyle, Slingsby Bethel, and the printer John Darby.
[92] See above, note. 13.
[93] Denzil Holles, *Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, Baron of Ifield in Sussex, from the year 1641, to 1648* (London: Tim Goodwin, 1699).
[94] Thomas Fairfax, *Short Memorials of Thomas Lord Fairfax* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1699).
[95] John Berkeley *Memoirs of Sir John Berkley, containing an account of his negotiation with Lieut, General Crömwel* ... (London: J. Darby, 1699).
[96] Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, 46-65, 87, 109; Patricia Crawford, *Denzil Holles, 1598-1680: a study of his Political Career* (London: Royal Historical Society 1979), 167; Andrew Hopper, *'Black Tom' Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 225-7

Elements of the New Model army were scapegoated in the 'memoirs' of Holles, Fairfax, and Berkeley as a way of vindicating their authors' innocence and defending their honour. Holles's text was the earliest, written in 1648 while the Parliamentary politician was in exile in France.[100] In the preface to the published version Toland called it a memoir for its 'historical' content, while recognizing that it was also a political apologia for a man and a party.[101] The work may nonetheless also be understood as a kind of autobiography, that is, an effort on Holles's part to make sense of the events which led to his exile by narrating them.[102] Beginning the story at the outbreak of the wars, Holles related how dishonest and wicked men overturned the good work accomplished by the struggle against the king by preventing a settlement with him, and taking over the state in order to further their own ambitions, resulting in political chaos.[103] Holles was, as his biographer notes, passionate about order and the preservation of social hierarchy, so that the army's ejection of eleven Presbyterian members of Parliament in the summer of 1647 was 'exceedingly against nature, and will turn all upside down.'[104] Ultimately, however, he would take refuge in providence: the inscrutable will of God explained both the initial descent into violence in 1642, and the triumph of the evildoers—Holles's political enemies—five years later.[105]

---

[97] Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, 69-74.
[98] Jones, *Court and Country*, 305-307; D. Hayton, 'The "country interest" and the party system, 1689-c. 1720' in C. Jones (ed.) *Party and Management in Parliament 1660-1784* (London: 1984), 44-5; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 93-9.
[99] Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, 74.
[100] See Scott, *Wars of the Three Kingdoms*, 130-157, and Ian Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1645-1653* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 140-234, for the 'political wars' between the army and Parliament.

It is apparent that Holles wrote his account of politics during the 1640s to vindicate himself and his allies. He blamed the army and its supporters for the notorious financial exactions on the populace, and for encouraging religious anarchy, 'getting into the Pulpits themselves, and venting either ridiculous or scandalous things, false and pernicious Doctrins.'[106] The dishonest party had perverted both the means and ends of

---

[101] [John Toland], 'Epistle to the Reader,' *Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles*, xii.
[102] The editors of a recent collection on early modern ego literature argue that 'self-writing' in this period was sometimes 'billeted upon texts with declared public interests;' Henk Dragstra, Sheila Ottway and Helen Wilcox (eds.), *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke: 2000), 1-13.
[103] Holles, *Memoirs*, 2, 71.
[104] Crawford, *Political Career*, 167, 173; Holles, *Memoirs*, 200-201; 207-208.
[105] Holles, *Memoirs*, 4, 212-13. The memoir concludes with a citation from Romans 11. 33, St Paul's response to his fellow Jews' resistance to the Christian gospel; 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable his judgments, and his ways past finding out!'
[106] Holles, *Memoirs*, 71, 8. As we shall see in a later chapter, the language Holles used to condemn the political and religious purges undertaken in Parliamentary-controlled counties, 'sequestring, impeaching of Treason, turning Men and their Families, turning Wife and Children to starve,' would be recapitulated in letters to Rev. John Walker over fifty years later.

Parliament's war effort to further their selfish lusts, while Holles and the 'honest party' opposed all actions which were innovative and arbitrary.[107] By dating the nation's downfall to 1647, Holles's memoir thus refuted the charge that Parliament's recourse to arms in 1642, which he and his puritan allies encouraged, was to blame for the decade's political and religious upheavals.[108] The true rebels were the men, Oliver Cromwell and Oliver St John in particular, Holles claimed had ruined what had been until 1647 a good and just cause by opposing him; 'All I desir'd and aim'd at in disbanding that schismatical factious Soldiery…was only to do my best endeavour to defend [King, Parliament and Kingdom] and my self from a rebellious Army that was marching up for all our destructions.'[109]

At the head of the army opposing Holles and his political allies in 1647 was Sir Thomas Fairfax; he remained Lord General of Parliament, and then the Commonwealth, army until his resignation in June 1650.[110] During the decade after the Restoration he wrote two brief memoirs of his experience, which were later edited and published together with an introductory apology by Fairfax's cousin Brian in 1699.[111] Fairfax's biographer has argued that *Short Memorials* were printed in part to refute Holles's denunciation of the New Model army, although like the memoirs of Holles and Ludlow it represented a Whiggish view of the civil wars as a warning against the danger of military rule.[112] The accounts of Fairfax's civil war actions in the *Short Memorials* were the product of two narrative re-interpretations: first, in the 1660s Fairfax related his experience 'not as it had actually been, but as he fancied it ought to have been;'[113] secondly, in the 1690s Sir Thomas's editor re-wrote his cousin's stories, excising anti-monarchical comments and removing some of their religious language.[114] Nevertheless, the *Short Memorials* conveyed accurately the old Roundhead's post-Restoration justification of his conduct to his family and to posterity.

---

[107] Holles, *Memoirs*, 16-17, 97; 32-3.

[108] A dramatic narrative of decline such as Holles's could of course be related by the army's supporters as an upswing for the better; see Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 17-19 on the construction of 'zig-zag' plots.

[109] Holles, *Memoirs*, 211, for his identification of his enemies as rebels and traitors see also 77, 99, 101, 177, and 208.

[110] Hopper, *Black Tom*, 113-5.

[111] 'Short memorials of some things to be cleared during my command in the Army,' and 'A Short Memoriall of ye Northern Actions during the ware there, from the year 1642 Till the year 1644.' An autograph version of the text held at the Bodleian is taken to be the most reliable copy, Bodleian MS Fairfax 36; Hopper, *Black Tom*, 225.

Fairfax vindicated his conduct during the troubles by emphasising God's blessing upon him and the wickedness of other people in and allied to Parliament's army. In the first memoir, the story of his military actions in the north from 1642 to 1644, the over-riding theme was God's deliverance and assistance.[115] At the battle of Tadcaster Fairfax's forces retreated 'by the mercy of God;' Nantwich was relieved 'by the Mercy of God;' a serious bout of pain and anxiety overcome thanks to 'the infinite goodness of God.'[116] Fairfax obviously believed that his and Parliament's successes in the north were providential, yet remembering these victories after the Restoration compelled him to a prophetic lamentation 'on the Labour I had laboured to do…all was Vanity and vexation of Spirit. For there is no remembrance of the Wise more than the Fool forever, seeing that which now is, in the Days to come shall be forgotten.'[117] In the second memoir Fairfax explained his family's choice of allegiance, and why Parliament's victories in 1645 and 1648 produced ill results, through the wickedness of others. In 1642 'many honest People' in Yorkshire, including the Fairfaxes, had been oppressed by the king's commissioners of array and forced to defend themselves; Parliament subsequently legitimated their recourse to arms.[118] The confusions between the army and Westminster which followed the miracle of victory in 1645 and 1646, Fairfax blamed on Agitators. This group, possessed with a natural inclination to alter the forms of government, alongside treacherous officers, and a 'levelling faction,' bore responsibility for the dishonourable acts of Pride's purge and the regicide. Fairfax portrayed himself as a passive spectator, carried down the stream of events 'by the Violence of it, rather than by my own Consent.'[119]

---

[112] Hopper, *Black Tom*, 226.

[113] This was S. R. Gardiner's judgment of the *Memorials* in his *History of the commonwealth and protectorate, 1649-60* Volume I (London: 1894), 293; cited in Hopper, *Black Tom*, 225.

[114] Hopper, *Black Tom*, 225.

[115] Fairfax, *Short Memorials*, 1-91.

[116] Fairfax, *Short Memorials*, 9-11, 76, 57; see also 7, 28, 31, 35, 40, 45, 55, 76, 86, and 90.

[117] Fairfax, *Short Memorials*, 91, citing Ecclesiastes 2.11,16. That the Almighty could have so plainly honoured Parliament's cause only to allow it subsequently to be blasted was a deeply vexing issue for many old puritans such as Fairfax after 1660; see Blair Worden, 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, and the Restoration' in Gerald Maclean (ed.), *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 111-56; N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002),

Fairfax's aim in writing his 'memorials,' and his cousin's in revising them was to repair his reputation as a military leader, a politician, and a member of Yorkshire's gentry.[120] The *Memorials* accomplished this by giving the credit for Fairfax's success to God alone, and extricated him from involvement in the regicide and the republic by blaming others for his and Parliament's political failures. His honour, and that of his household, was to be preserved for the future by the *Memorial's* remembrance of God's inscrutable providence and his own innocence.

The former royalist officer Sir John Berkeley might also have feared the condemnation of posterity when he composed a narrative, probably during the

---

132-7; Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Hopper, *Black Tom*, 122-4.

[118] Fairfax, *Short Memorials*, 94; additionally, See Hopper, *Black Tom*, 130-146 for an analysis of the social and religious basis of the Fairfaxes' popular parliamentarianism.

[119] Fairfax, *Short Memorials*, 107, 119, 108.

[120] Hopper, *Black Tom*, 229; on Fairfax's posthumous reputation see pages 231-3.

Interregnum, about his activities on the king's behalf from July to December 1647.[121] His was hardly a story of success; the first part of the work told of Berkeley's negotiations on the king's behalf with Parliament's army, which ultimately failed; the second recounted the attempt to secure the king's escape from the army via the Isle of Wight, a similarly disastrous venture. In the latter story Berkeley claimed his colleague John Ashburnham disclosed the king's location to Governor Hammond, a blatant retrospective effort to deny the charge that his own indiscretion had botched the escape.[122] In the negotiation narrative Berkeley declared that the army 'Grandees' including Cromwell and Ireton, genuinely desired to settle with the king.'[123] The collapse of the talks between the king and the Grandees was blamed on the pressure from Agitators, Levellers and parliamentary Presbyterians in the autumn of 1647, which forced Cromwell and Ireton into supporting the 'tumultuous' party of the army who sought justice against the king. Berkeley claimed that the Agitators believed that God 'had put all things under their feet, and therefore they were bound to finish the Work of the Lord, which was to alter the Government according to their first Design.'[124] Berkeley's memoir could therefore be published in 1699 by Toland's literary circle as a royalist witness to the danger posed by a standing army to the people's lives, liberties and estates.

---

[121] Berkeley, *Memoirs*. D. H. Hayton, 'Berkeley, John, first Baron of Berkeley of Stratton (bap. 1607, d. 1678),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2217, accessed 24 Jan 2008]. Worden argues that the printed text was derived from either a manuscript which Ludlow copied into 'A Voyce from the Watchtower, or one of Ludlow's papers which Toland and Darby came to possess. The work was evidently prepared for publication in exactly the same way as the 'Voyce;' *Roundhead Reputations*, 87.

[122] Berkeley, *Memoirs*, 56-59, 63. Sean Kelsey, 'Ashburham, John (1602/3-1671),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/738, accessed 31 January 2008].

[123] Berkeley, *Memoirs*, 20; this understanding he derived from two unnamed Parliamentary officers, who he kept anonymous because they are 'obnoxious to the present power. The reference to 'present power' suggests the text was composed during Interregnum.

[124] Berkeley, *Memoirs*, 43.

The histories composed by Holles, Fairfax and Berkeley were efforts to defend their author's honour in the future by framing how their deeds would be remembered by posterity.[125] Furthermore, first as manuscripts, and then as printed texts, these memoirs of the civil wars were, not unlike funeral monuments, intended to enhance the collective honour of their families.[126] In each case, the writers' defended the integrity of his reputation from injury in a narrative which demonstrated his innocence and placed blame for what had gone wrong on his enemies.[127] The fact that in each story the guilty party was the New Model army, or a portion thereof, facilitated the memoirs' re-deployment by the Toland-Shaftesbury circle in 1697-8 as historical vindications of republicanism for the country interest. The image from the troubled past which radical Whigs encouraged by these publications—of an army and officer corps who trampled the people's liberties, commonwealth principles betrayed by self-interest—was one through which they wished their readers to view William III, the Junto Whigs, and their standing army; it was an picture which replicated the radicals' own sense of disappointment at the king's policies.[128] The radical Whigs of 1699 were not to be the last group that critiqued the post-Revolution polity through scapegoating civil war figures; such an approach was to be a hallmark of the Tory historiographical reaction.

---

[125] Mervyn James, 'English politics and the concept of honour, 1485-1642' *Past and Present Supplement* 1978) 324.

[126] Nigel Llewellyn, 'Honour in Life, Death and in the Memory: Funeral Monuments in Early Modern England' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1996), 179; on 'collective honour' see Linda Pollock, 'Honor, Gender and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570-1700,' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 16. See Hopper, *Black Tom*, 152-68, for the Fairfax family's sense of honour, which blended martial valour with Christian humility.

[127] The aristocratic rhetorical pattern of confrontation as a means to define the self is explored by Debora Shuger in 'Life-writing in seventeenth-century England' in Patrick Coleman, Jayne Lewis, and Jill Kowalik (eds.) *Representations of the Self from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 71-2.

[128] Worden, *Roundhead Reputations*, 65; Jones, *Court and Country*, 305; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 264.

Tory vindications

This section examines civil war histories which undertook to vindicate the honour of Charles I and his cause to criticise the political transformations wrought by the Revolution, and to argue that some of the Revolution's chief beneficiaries were historic and on-going threats to the peace of the realm.

By the spring of 1700 King William had removed nearly all Junto ministers from his government; an attempt to impeach them the following year re-united the Whig party into a kind of unified opposition.[129] Their foes were Tory ministers and parliamentarians, the 'country interest' diminishing as a factor in politics as another war with France appeared almost certain.[130] The year 1701 also witnessed the return, after a thirty-seven year absence, of the Convocation of the Church's Canterbury province, its lower house determined to address the dangers to religion presented by anti-clericalism, occasional conformity, and blasphemous writings.[131] Another high priority for 'High Churchmen' and their Tory advocates was refuting the recent attacks on the reputation of the Stuarts, in particular the injuries done to the memory of Charles the Martyr. Tory civil war histories, including Warwick's, Clarendon's, Thomas Herbert's, and Edward Walker's, were public vindications of Charles I and his cause, and public reminders about the continuity between the wars' true originators and the strongest defenders of the Revolution settlement—Whigs and Dissenters.

---

[129] Jones, *Court and Country*, 312-14; Speck, *Birth of Britain*, 6; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 99-104; Claydon, *William III*, 107.

[130] In September 1701 Louis XIV recognized James Edward Stuart as the lawful king of England; Holmes, *Politics in the Age of Anne*, 147, Jones, *Court and Country*, 315.

[131] Toland was a one of the Convocation's 'prime suspects;' Bennett, *Tory Crisis*, 16; Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 212-14.

Sir Philip Warwick's *Memoires of the reigne of King Charles I* was a narrative of high politics combined with a series of short political biographies, personal anecdotes, and philosophical reflections. While MacGillivray praises Warwick for attending to the geography of allegiance and to Parliament's economic advantages relative to the king, a more consistent theme of his history, set out in its opening reflection, was Charles I's superior moral resources.[132] The king was 'endowed with habits of knowledge and piety, and so unapt to have made any invasion upon the liberty or property of his Subjects, but as some early rude attaques of a popular faction seem'd to force him to defend his Soveraignity.'[133] The willingness of Sir Richard Weston, Sir John Savile, and Sir Thomas Wentworth to serve as the king's ministers, 'having bin great assertors of the Subjects liberty,' was proof that 'tho' the King resolv'd to maintain regall and soveraigne authority, vested in him by law; yet that he intended no absolute or arbitrary power.'[134] Further evidence of the king's virtue was demonstrated by the peace and prosperity of the 1630s; 'all this [goodness] at a time, when all the rest of the world was embroiled in war….And it could scare be otherwise, when wee shall give the true character of this highly good, but most unfortunate, Prince.'[135] Warwick did not blame the troubles on a surfeit of national bliss.[136]

Warwick defended the king's commitment to 'the foundations of his own Church, and the grounds of the Reformation. The king protected the church's government to the very end of his life because the bishops were 'evidences of the mystery of redemption'.[137] Archbishop Laud's good intentions were also underlined, with an acknowledgment that his strident defence of the Church's rights 'as the law of this our Realm hadd apply'd to our circumstances,' had put him at odds with many common lawyers.[138] The prelate, and, as it turned out, the king himself, were deficient in the necessary statecraft to suppress 'malignant humors' in the body politic. Warwick believed the 'troubles and uncomfortableness' of the king's reign were the result of a long-term constitutional struggle, driven by an aristocratic-clerical conspiracy to roll back the royal prerogative and institute the 'sharing of soeveraignty between the King and the two Houses of Parliament.' The Long Parliament's 'suppression of Regall jurisdiction' was the method by which it '[drew] off the reverence due to the Crown and publick authority, and [lodged] it all in the popular greatnes of a House of Commons.'[139] The king was able to rally an armed defence of his prerogative rights thanks to the adherents of 'the good and Christian principles of the Church of England,' among whom 'his memory is precious to this hour.'[140]

---

[132] MacGillivary, *Restoration Historians*, 59-61.

[133] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 1.

[134] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 47-8.

[135] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 64.

[136] See by way of contrast [John Davies], *The Civil Warres of Great Britain and Ireland* (London: R.W. for Philip Chetwind, 1661), sig. A1; James Health, *A Brief Chronicle of all the chief Action so fatally falling out in these three Kingdoms* (London: John Best, 1662) sig. A1v. [W.C.] *History of the Commons Warre of England* (London: Joshua Coniers, 1662) claimed that the English were 'not able to bear the weight of so great a happiness, [and] sank into a general ruin,' 1; see also MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 237-42.

Warwick's *Memoirs* attempted to justify the historical verdicts of God.[141] He confessed that he had expected the Lord to deliver King Charles, like King David, 'by teaching his hands to fight, and giving victory unto his Anointed.' The king's eventual demise, he wrote, 'stung me into great melancholy.'[142] Although Warwick had no difficulty discerning God's hand in the Restoration, he also attributed Charles II's return to the unsettling nature of the 'Innovators' false and pernicious principles, 'made to overthrow, but not to settle any government.'[143] Every age had similar people who sought to overturn the constitution and used religious convictions to hide their rebellious intentions. The peace and security of the realm, Warwick warned, would be safeguarded in the future from these inveterate dissemblers only if the king would endeavour to 'preserve his establisht religion and law.'[144] While a member of the Cavalier Parliament Sir Philip honoured the precious memory of Charles I by consistently opposing toleration for Nonconforming Protestants, and by maintaining the monarch's 'absolute though limited' powers.[145] Although both these principles were themselves undermined by the Revolution settlement of 1689, and the latter even more so by the Act of Settlement in 1701, the publication of Warwick's history in 1702 reaffirmed the bond between telling the truth about the wars' genesis, vindicating Charles I's honour, and upholding the rights of the Church and the crown in the present.[146] This connection was made even stronger with the accession to the throne of the Royal Martyr's granddaughter Anne in 1702, and the release the same year of the first volume of her maternal grandfather Edward Hyde, the earl of Clarendon's monumental *History of the Rebellion.*[147]

---

[137] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 67-9, 77. The introduction of the new prayer-book to the Scottish Kirk was simply a continuation of Elizabeth and James's earlier policies of bringing greater conformity between the two national churches; 100, 121-2.

[138] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 79.

[139] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 7-9, 60, 176, 189-91.

[140] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 205-206.

[141] For example, as a reminder of the inevitability of God's confounding the wicked, Warwick noted that all the men who first rose against the king in 1641-42, 'whether innovating Lords and Gentry, or the Presbyterians Ministers or Assembly of Divines, or the city of London, or the chief Persons in the army of Essex' subsequently received 'a visible disappointment and judgement;' Warwick, *Memoirs*, 297. On deaths as signs of divine punishment in popular Protestant literature see Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) , 69-75

---

[142] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 346.
[143] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 430.
[144] Warwick, *Memoirs*, 2, 403-4.
[145] Smith, 'Warwick, Philip,' *ODNB* online; [Sir Philip Warwick], *A Discourse on Government* (London: 1694), 20. This treatise was written around the same time, in 1678, as the *Memoirs*.
[146] Harris, *Revolutions*, 336-350; Claydon, *William III*, 60; Jones, *Court and Country*, 310. On the Toleration Act see Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 186-90.
[147] Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*...Three Volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1702-1704). On the complicated composition of the *History* see the articles by C. H. Firth, 'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion' *English Historical Review* 19 (1904), 26-54, 246-62, and 464-483. Recent assessments of Clarendon's historical

The publication of Clarendon's *History* was supervised by his son Laurence, earl of Rochester, who also wrote a preface for each of the three volumes.[148] The *History* was the product of folding together two antecedent texts: one written from 1646 to 1648 as a vindication of the policies and conduct of Charles I's non-military advisors during the civil war, including Clarendon, the other composed from 1668 to 1670 after Clarendon's fall as a personal exoneration of his service to two Stuart kings.[149] Rochester published these political and personal vindications to restore the honour of both his father and his father's royal masters: the former Lord Chancellor had embodied the excellence and balance of England's constitution, working constantly 'to keep things even between the King and the People.'[150] Rochester stated that his father's book was being made public as a timely defence of Charles I's reputation against the 'many Memoirs, Narratives, and pieces of History come out, as it were, on purpose to justify the taking up Armes against that King.'[151] Rochester was also confident that the *History* would vindicate his father as an historian: from the dead Clarendon could give counsel to his granddaughter the queen:

---

method, its merits and intellectual context include Ronald Hutton, 'Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*' *English Historical Review* 97 (1982), 70-88; Martine Watson Brownley, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); Richardson, *Debate on the English Revolution*, 29-36; Hicks, *Neoclassical history*, 55-80; Paul Seaward. 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the civil wars of Europe' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 289-303.

[148] W. A. Speck, 'Hyde, Laurence, first earl of Rochester (*bap.* 1642, *d.* 1711),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14332, accessed 26 Nov 2007]; Woolf, *Reading History*, 277, 293.

[149] Firth, 'Clarendon's History,' 26; Hutton, 'Clarendon's *History*', 87.

[150] Charles II's Lord Chancellor had been forced into exile in 1667, his son wrote, by the 'many industrious Enemies' whose 'several wild pretensions' he could not possibly have satisfied ; Rochester, 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 12. On Clarendon's fall in 1667 see N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: Engl[illegible] in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 105-8. Rochester, 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 22.

[151] Rochester, 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 3.

'the accounts he gives of times past, come seasonably to guide You through the times present, and those to come.'[152]

Importantly for Rochester, the *History of the Rebellion* demonstrated that Charles I fell 'in the Defence of [his] Church' at the hands of men 'who were no better friends to Monarchy than to true Religion.' They had complained about the 'Ceremonies and outward Order of the Church' and then attempted its destruction in order to overturn the government.[153] Clarendon's civil war history reminded the nation's chief magistrate of the eternal danger posed to the Church and state from Protestant Nonconformists; 'this History hath shewn Your Majesty their fruits in the late times, by which You shall know them still.'[154] In other words, *History* established once more the lineal descent of early eighteenth-century Nonconformists from mid- seventeenth century religious rebels.[155] Rochester had published his father's vindicatory narratives to remind his niece, and other readers, of who was truly to blame for the wars, and that their guilt for past crimes justified retraining actions against them in the present, such as the abolition of Dissenters' academies and the outlawing of occasional conformity.[156] Happily for him, the increasing market for historical writings made it possible to disseminate Clarendon's *History*, and its truths, to an even wider public.[157]

---

[152] Rochester, 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 3; Rochester highlighted two political lessons for on pages four and five: a king who falls under an interest contrary to his people will suffer, and people who seek to defend their rights by force will bring chaos upon the nation.

[153] Rochester, 'Preface' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. II, sig. A2r-v.

[154] Rochester, 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. III, sig. D2r, C2r; as schools of sedition the Dissenters' academies were for Rochester a particular threat to religion and public peace; 'Preface,' *History of the Rebellion*, vol. II, sig. B1r-v.

[155] On the sense among turn-of-the-century Anglicans and Tories that Nonconformists and, to a lesser extent, Whigs, were latter-day Roundheads see Hoppitt, *Land of Liberty*, 2; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 66-8. The importance of notions of descent for creating the sense of continuity is highlighted by Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 58-62.

[156] For the political context of the Occasional Conformity bills see Holmes, *Politics in the age of Anne*, 97-103; Hoppitt, *Land of Liberty*, 231. Between 1702 and 1705 three bills were introduced to ban the practice of taking Anglican communion at least once a year in order to meet the religious test for serving on corporations and holding public office; each one was defeated.

John Nutt, a printer at Stationer's court, published an abridged version of the first volume of *History of the Rebellion* in 1703, available for four shillings.[158] In his preface, Nutt argued that the singular terribleness of England's former troubles, which he was ashamed to admit had occurred in his own country, was best forgotten. But because the 'Blot' of the rebellion was 'too notorious to be hid' the next best thing to its oblivion was to offer readers the 'clear and impartial account' provided by Clarendon. Having heard that 'the Price of that History was the Reason a great many gave for their not reading it,' Nutt had determined to make it available to a wider audience; the abridgement, he claimed, truly followed the 'Thread of his Narration, and preserv'd the Course of his History entire and unbroken.'[159]

Nutt did not redact his source text to offer a new but still authoritative view of the civil wars and their implications for the present, but instead faithfully presented an abbreviated version of the *History*.[160] For example, Clarendon's assessment of the 1630s as a time when the three kingdoms 'enjoy'd the greatest Calm, and the fullest measure of Felicity, that any people in any Age, for so long time together, have been bless'd with; to the wonder, and envy of all the other parts of *Christendom*,' was rearranged to read 'a greater Measure of Felicity, and that to the Envy of all other Parts of Christendom, than any People in any Age for so long a Time have been blest withal.'[161] Nutt also conveyed Clarendon's interpretation of characters and episodes, such as his assessment of the attitude of the 'leading men' of the Long Parliament towards the Church: 'they who had made in their hearts the most Destructive Vows against the Church, never durst Communicate their Bloody Wishes to their Best Friends' became in the abridgement 'they who made in their Hearts the most pernicious Vows against the Church, never durst impart their bloody Wishes to their best Friends.'[162] Clarendon's summation on the legislation of the opening of the 1640 Parliament as 'everlasting Monuments of the King's Princely and Fatherly Affection to his People' was rendered into 'everlasting Instances of the King's Paternal Affection to his People.'[163]

---

[157] Hoppitt, *Land of Liberty*, 177-82; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 223-8; Woolf, *Reading History*, 203-54.
[158] Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The history of the rebellion and civil wars in England begun in the year 1641 With the precedent passages and actions that contributed thereunto. In five books...Faithfully abridg'd. With and alphabetical index* (London: John Nutt, 1703); Woolf, *Reading History*, 229.
[159] Nutt, *History abridged*, sig. A2r; on abridgements of historical writing see Woolf, *Reading History*, 245-46, 274-77.
[160] See above, 'Memorable Re-presentations,' pages 207-9 for Nathaniel Crouch's re-working of Baker's *Chronicle* during the Exclusion crisis.

Occasionally Nutt intervened to soften Clarendon's judgment, such as the earl's interpretation of the social basis of the 'names of contention.' Nutt included the sentence from the *History of the Rebellion* that 'from those contests [in front of Whitehall] rose the Terms Roundhead and Cavalier,' but excised a subsequent clause in which Clarendon expanded Cavaliers to mean the 'Servants to the King' and the Round-Heads as 'the Rabble contemned, and despised.'[164] Nutt shortened the narrative by removing a number of Clarendon's personal digressions.[165] Other segments of the *History* not included in the abridgement seem to have been cut simply for reasons of space; the printer excised most of two paragraphs in which Clarendon speculated that it was Lord George Digby who leaked the king's intention to arrest the five members.[166] Yet overall Nutt's abridgement presented a miniature portrait of Clarendon's titanic narrative, even when altering his metaphors: Clarendon's argument that Parliament's Militia Ordinance was 'the most Avowed foundation of all the Miseries that have followed' was rendered 'all Miseries that followed, flow'd in a great Measure from that Fountain.'[167]

---

[161] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 58; Nutt, *History abridged*, 35.

[162] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 183; Nutt, *History abridged*, 137. On Clarendon's treatment of the (somewhat amorphous) group of evil leaders whose malignancy derailed the Long Parliament see MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 212-13.

[163] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 251; Nutt, *History abridged*, 179.

[164] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 267; Nutt, *History abridged*, 223. Clarendon's 'social interpretation' of the war's origin was later supported by Christopher Hill, 'Lord Clarendon and the English Revolution' in *Puritanism and Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), 201-5, and refuted by Hutton, 'Clarendon's *History*.'

[165] Such as his defence of one of the declarations he penned on the king's behalf from York; Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 365-66; Nutt, *History abridged*, 333.

Nutt had no doubt recognized that money was to be made by entering his affordable version of a popular work into the expanding market for historical literature in general and civil war histories in particular.[168] Unsurprisingly, however, Nutt did not highlight the private rewards which would accrue to him, but instead emphasised its benefit to the commonwealth. The excellence of Clarendon's *History* had made Nutt 'wish the Book had been more publick than [he] found it was, that everyone might see, what Artifices the busie Men of those Days made use of to ensnare the People.'[169] Nutt argued that since the same danger lurked in the present, 'some Men [wanting] only an Opportunity to open those Wounds afresh;' the abridged version Clarendon's *History* could be the wider public's weapon 'against the like Attempts' to mislead them once again into violence.[170] Current misrepresentations about the causes of the wars enhanced the likelihood of another conflagration; peace and security would be achieved by this public's remembering in the future who was really to blame—Nonconformists and their defenders.[171]

---

[166] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 282; Nutt, *History abridged*, 232-33.
[167] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I, 336; Nutt, *History abridged*, 294.
[168] Woolf, *Reading History*, 281-317. Nutt's most famous publication, Jonathan Swift's *A Tale of a Tub. Written for the universal improvement of mankind*... (London: 1704), was an intervention into another historical controversy, the struggle between 'ancients' and 'moderns;' Henry R. Plomer, *Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668-1725,* edited by Arundell Esdaile (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922), 222; Levine, *Humanism and History*, 155-61.
[169] Nutt, *History abridged*, sig. A1v.
[170] Nutt, *History abridged*, sig. A2r.

Clarendon's history was published by his son and abridged by Nutt in part to present an image of Dissenters, the descendants of the rebellion's religious supporters, as the greatest threat to the nation. Two other historical writings released around the same time, one by a former Roundhead and the other by an old Cavalier, recapitulated the innocence of Charles I to bolster the reputation of the Tory party. The *Memoirs* of Thomas Herbert (1702), a travel writer, antiquary, and former Parliamentarian, was really a collection of epistolarly narratives and polemical tracts dating from the 1640s and the present.[172] Herbert had been one of a select number of Parliamentarians who attended the king from early 1647 until his execution; his 'memoirs' of that service were evidently originally a letter written by him to fellow antiquary Sir William Dugdale in late 1679 or early 1680.[173] While Herbert had assured Dugdale that his letter related only 'the Occurrents of such Court-Passages as this Relator was an Eye-Witness to,' he nonetheless took considerable space to narrate the main events of the second civil war.[174] By beginning his story in 1646, Herbert avoided, among other things, having to account for the king's questionable policies during the 1630s, the level of blame to assign the

---

[171] Nutt, *History abridged*, sig. A2r. In *Representation and Misrepresentation* Knights notes that partisan discourse in print culture involved telling stories with heroes and villains, although he does not examine stories about the past, 209-18, 238, 276; but see his 'Tory History,' 358-60.

[172] Thomas Herbert, *Memoirs of the two last years of the reign of that unparallell'd prince, of ever blessed memory, King Charles I...*(London : printed for Robert Clavell, 1702).

[173] Ronald H. Fritze, 'Herbert, Sir Thomas, first baronet (1606-1682),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, Jan 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13049, accessed 24 Jan 2008]. This 'memoir' was first called *Threndonia Carolina* and was apparently used by Anthony à Wood for his *Athenae Oxoniensis*, published in 1691.

[174] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 78, 49-66. Textual analysis, and another letter from Herbert to Dugdale (*Memoirs*, 145), suggest that Herbert derived his account of the risings in the south-east, and Hamilton's invasion, from Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle of the Kings of England* (London: 1660, Wing B504); e.g. *Memoirs*, 54-58 closely mirrors *Chronicle*, 485-6.

Long Parliament for the outbreak of hostilities, and his reasons for taking up arms against his king; indeed, the entire question of culpability was circumvented by his periodization.[175] Cutting out the early 1640s allowed Herbert to focus the narrative on his personal interactions with a virtuous king seeking to bring peace to his domain, and journeying with Christian patience towards his doom.[176] This emphasis was no doubt what prompted the printer Robert Clavell, who had earlier published Thomas Frankland's hyper-royalist *Annals*, to add Herbert's voice to the debate over the memory of Charles I.[177]

The fact that Herbert's account was conveyed as a letter underscored its status as eye-witness testimony; Herbert's access to the king—he was Charles's last groom of the bedchamber—was thus a crucial factor contributing to his authority and his *Memoirs'* authenticity.[178] The most prominent theme of Herbert's story was the goodness of Charles I, demonstrated by emphasizing the king's piety.[179] For example, the king's response to the Army's 'Remonstrance' (November 1648) which intimated that he was to be put on trial was to go into prayer; 'and was a good while private in his Addresses to God, ever having recourse to him by Prayer and Meditation, in what condition soever he was, as being the surest way to find Comfort.'[180] Herbert's narration of national events in 1648 was done to vindicate the king's innocence in regard to the Scottish invasion, which some claimed Charles had secret knowledge about from his wife. Herbert's conclusion was simply 'that the report concerning the Letter of Intelligence from the Queen is fictitious, only design'd to asperse the King, and to blemish his Integrity.'[181] Herbert repeatedly underscored that the king's overriding desire was for peace, and that it was very nearly achieved. By October of 1648 the Newport negotiations had reached the point where 'most Men…verily believe[d] there would be a happy Union and Agreement between His Majesty and the Parliament.'[182] Not surprisingly, he blamed Parliament's army, particularly its officers, for wrecking the chances of a settlement, and for ensuring that the king was executed.[183] Herbert's condemnation of the New Model was not part of a larger story of its betrayal of the Good Old Cause; rather, it complemented his vindication of the king's enduring virtue, and the public's remembrance of it. Herbert was thus a Parliamentarian witness to the truth about Charles I and the wars first disseminated in the king's book, *Eikon Basilike*: the Lord's anointed had suffered and died at the hand of a faction, ultimately because of the nation's sin.[184]

---

[175] As Zerubavel notes, establishing beginnings and ending of a narrative is part of the process of assigning responsibility and culpability for events; *Time Maps*, 99.

[176] Herbert was pardoned by Charles II in 1660, and created a baronet in thanks for his service to Charles I; Fritze, 'Herbert, Thomas' *ODNB online*.

[177] Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers*, 47; Robert Clavell, 'Preface' to Herbert, *Memoirs*, sig. A2r-v. Clavell also included a second letter from Herbert to Dugdale, Major Huntington's letter to Dugdale, a narrative by Colonel Edward Cooke, and a letter from Thomas Firebrace. Clavell stated that these epistles were all copied from a manuscript held by the recently deceased Bishop of Ely (Francis Turner?), and that he had learned that there were additional copies among the Dugdale manuscripts at the Bodleian. To these letters Clavell added several 'small tracts, which give some Account of the Affairs of those Times; of the Character of King Charles I and of his just Claim and Title to his Divine Mediations.'

[178] On the widespread perception that historical writing, at least among ecclesiastics, was a series of personal testimonies see John Spurr, '"A Special kindness for dead bishops": The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 313-335. Seventeenth-century people were well accustomed to the transmission of information and intelligence through newsletters; see Ian Atherton, '"The Itch Grown a Disease": manuscript transmission of news in the seventeenth century' in Joad Raymond (ed.), *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Cass, 1999), 39-59; Gary Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 144-80.

[179] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 12, 40, 45-6, 106, 118. Herbert did pepper his memoir with antiquarian observations, both textual-philological and object-oriented, perhaps to demonstrate his erudition to Dugdale; see pages 9, 24-4, 30, 32, 39, 95-96. On the 'streams of antiquarianism' see Daniel Woolf, 'Images of the Antiquary in

---

Seventeenth-Century England' in Susan Pierce (ed.), *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1707-2007* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 2007), 13.

[180] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 105.

[181] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 65; 61-66.

[182] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 44; 27, 30, 34.

[183] Herbert, *Memoirs*, 18-19, 32-3, 77. Despite the Army's culpability for the king's death, Herbert noted at several points the civility with which its officers, and even private soldiers, treated their royal prisoner; see pages 25, 86, and 101.

[184] Lacey, *Cult of King Charles*, 46-7.

The final vindication of the royal martyr's memory to consider, *Historical Discourses* (1705), was the work of another witness to Charles I's last months, Sir Edward Walker.[185] He was a herald who had served as secretary to the Privy Council during the first civil war, and then as chief secretary to the king at the time of the Newport treaty.[186] A series of notes identified the occasion and time of each discourse's composition; in the penultimate notice, dated 24 October 1664, Walker declared that he would not make his work public because of the Act of Oblivion had ensured that 'Persons of all Parties and interests enjoy the Safety, Happiness and Protection' of the king's government. Over the next decade Walker's reticence for the sake of public reconciliation waned in the face of his friends' encouragement to publish, for which he made provision following his demise. He was confident that his work would do justice to the 'Memories of courageous, loyal and worthy Men,' especially the co-author of the first 'memoir,' King Charles I.[187] Sometime in the early years of Queen Anne's reign Walker's great-grandson Henry Clopton decided the time had come to honour his ancestor's wishes.[188] That decision was prompted, he suggested in the book's dedication to the queen, by the recent rise in 'the impudent Asserting, and industrious Propagating' of the principles which underlay the regicide ('a black Tragedy'). The *Discourses* were thus presented to the public as a historical refutation of 'the Party' still hostile to Crown and Church.[189]

---

[185] Edward Walker, *Historical Discourses, upon several occasions: viz. 1. The happy progress and success of the arms of K. Charles I* (London: W.B. for Sam. Keble, 1705). The book contained three annalistic narratives, three tracts, one biography, one collection of primary documents, and one survey of King Charles I's reign; most were written during the Interregnum while Walker was in exile.

[186] Hubert Chesshyre, 'Walker, Sir Edward (1612-1677),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28475 accessed 16 Jan 2008]. Apart from a joining Charles II in Scotland for some months in 1650 Walker spent the Interregnum in exile on the continent.

[187] Walker, *Historical discourses*, sig. a2r-b2v. The 'Postscript' recording his decision to publish after his death was dated 1 August 1674. See also C. H. Firth, 'Walker, Sir Edward (1612-1677)' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1899), via *ODNB* online edn. January 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28475 accessed 16 Jan 2008].

[188] Clopton published the *Discourses* through Samuel Keble, a noted vendor of theological and antiquarian works Plomer, *Dictionary of Printers*, 176-7.

The first two discourses were annals of the royalist campaigns of 1644 and 1645 in the west, the 'happy Progress' and 'Memorials' respectively.[190] Walker evidently regarded his task to be the plain recorder of military actions, choosing not to investigate the causes of the conflict, apart from asserting that it was a rebellion 'raised by the Factious, and pursued by the miserably deceived People of this Kingdom.' Later on in the discourse, however, he did offer a thesis consistent with his heraldic vocation: had the nobility in most of the kingdom not been forced by their love of luxury to 'manumise their Villians [sic]' the habits of deference and obedience, so prevalent in loyal Cornwall, would have prevented 'this War, which (under Pretence of Religion and Liberties) is to introduce Heresie in Doctrine, Parity in Conditions, and to destroy the King, Nobility and Gentry.'[191] Walker argued that the king's victories in 1644 were thanks to God's blessing, good counsel, and, by implication, fighting for the right principles.[192] The tone and content of the annal for 1645 was understandably more sombre in tone and content; that year's 'unfortunate Successes' were blamed on the king's over-reliance on Prince

---

[189] Henry Clopton, 'Dedication,' in Walker, *Historical discourses*, sig. A2r-6r.

[190] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 'The happy Progress and Success of the Arms of K. Charles I. of ever blessed memory' from March to November 1644,' 3-121; 'Memorials of his said Majesty's unfortunate Success in the Year following,' 125-153. The fullest explanation of why Walker wrote this piece is in the fifth discourse, his refutation of William Lilly's *Monarchy or no Monarchy in England* (London: H. Blunden, 1651: Wing L2228). In his book Lilly claimed to have seen a manuscript written by Walker concerning the Irish Rebellion in which the king had obliterated the words 'Irish rebels' and replaced them with 'Irish subjects.' Lilly used this as evidence of Charles I's 'affection and countenancing' of the Irish rebellion. Walker replied that the manuscript in question had no relation to Irish affairs; in fact, it had been commissioned by the king to recount 'the variety of Actions' of the year 1644, during which time the king 'by His Conduct and Valour' had bested the armies of Waller, Essex and Manchester; Walker, *Historical discourses*, 227-8.

[191] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 5-6, 50-1. The most recent explanation of Cornish royalism emphasizes its ethnic roots; Mark Stoyle, *Soldiers and Strangers: An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 33-52.

[192] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 5-6.

Rupert's counsel, and dissention both within the officer corps and between royalist gentry and the king's army.[193] The second discourse concluded with the slightly critical counterfactual that 'if from May 1645 unto that time 46 His Majesty had been but successful in any one of His Undertakings, or had done the contrary to what He did, He had been either Master of all, or at least had kept Himself on Foot a much longer time.'[194] Thus, by listening to the wrong people the praiseworthy leader of 1644 had lost to his rebellious subjects.

While Charles I bore some responsibility for the collapse of the royalist war effort, he was in no way culpable for civil wars. Walker's eighth discourse, a potted account of English politics from 1625 to 1642, was a strident vindication of his former master.[195] In it he argued that 'the Factious Part of traitorous Subjects' were not only the 'principal Causers of the King's Misfortune,' but were and are also 'the only Tyrants and Usurpers, that for a long time, and still do, oppress the People.' The king's controversial actions of the later 1620s, such as the forced loans and dissolving three Parliaments in succession, were simply efforts to 'preserve His Royal Authority.' If there had been any 'Acts of seeming Oppression or Usurpation done in that time, they must be ascribed to the Commons, either doing or forcing such to be done.'[196] Walker emphasised the unparalleled prosperity and harmony enjoyed during the 1630s while the king governed 'without Comptrollers.' The king had issued the Book of Sports in 1634 'to free His People from the greatest Tyranny imaginable, Imposition upon silly Consciences by seditious Puritan Ministers,' men whose Sabbatarianism concealed a penchant for treason, murder, and rebellion. Thus during the Interregnum Walker told the truth about Charles I's reign by blaming the nation's ills on his foes, a method whose pedigree dated back to the paper skirmishes between the king and the Long Parliament in 1641-42.[197] At the start of the eighteenth century Walker's accusatory narrative would enter the domain of print to advance the cause of a young Warwickshire gentleman and his political allies.

---

[193] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 125, 133, 150.

[194] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 152-53.

[195] Walker, 'A short Review of the Life and Actions of King Charles I,' *Historical discourses*, 361-69.This piece, dated October 1655, followed a rejoinder to Hamon L'Estrange's biography of Charles I, *The reign of King Charles* (London: E.C., 1655, Wing L1189), *Historical discourses*, 314-60; therefore it might have been written as a counter-narrative to L'Estrange.

[196] Walker, *Historical discourses*, 361, 365.

It is highly probable that Clopton recognized from the popular acclaim bestowed upon Clarendon's *History* that money could be made by entering his ancestor's writings into the burgeoning market for civil war memoirs. It is almost certain that he published them to enhance his reputation with his Sovereign, explicitly reminding her in the book's dedication of his great-grandfather's service to Charles I as secretary and Garter King of Arms. Clopton also believed that his ancestor's vindication of Charles I, and vilification of his opponents, ought to encourage the queen and her ministers to provide 'further securities for the church and monarchy against its enemies.'[198] Establishing the truth about the identity of the innocent and the guilty from the civil war past thus demonstrated the necessity of protecting the public from the descendants of the guilty in the present. In other words, by taking action presently against Dissenters, whose religion masked naked political ambition, the queen and her ministers would truly honour the memory of Charles I and serve that national interest.[199] They would also limit the damage wrought to the Church by the growth of Protestant Nonconformity's public profile since 1689 when its adherents were exempted from the penal statutes enforcing religious uniformity.[200] It is thus to the monumental historical vindication of that community and the protection afforded it by the Toleration Act which this chapter now turns.

---

[197] On royalist explanations of the civil wars before the Restoration see Mark Hartman, 'Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution, 1640 to 1660' (Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 1978), 104-117.

[198] Clopton, 'Dedication,' Walker, *Historical discourses*, sig. A2r-6r.

[199] On the saturation of public discourse with the idea that religious language masked a politics of self or party interest see Mark Knights, 'Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, Moderation and Zeal' in Stephen Taylor and David L. Wykes (eds.) *Parliament and Dissent* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 41-58.

A Puritan Vindicator

The last history to consider was an edited memoir which was published to defend the reputation of a man, Richard Baxter, who had come to embody the cause of moderate puritan Christianity during the troubles and after the disappointments of the Restoration's religious settlement. By re-telling Baxter's story of English puritans during and after the troubles Calamy aimed to reassert the truthfulness of Dissenters' religion and the protections afforded their churches by the Toleration Act.

Edmund Calamy was not the first man to edit and publish Richard Baxter's enormous manuscript history of his life and times entitled *Reliquiae Baxterianae*; that honour (or rather, burden) fell to Presbyterian clergyman Matthew Sylvester, who had inherited Baxter's papers in 1691.[201] The minister's reverence for the pre-eminent representative of Restoration Nonconformity unfortunately resulted in poor editorial practice; published in 1696 at over nine hundred folio pages, Sylvester's version of *Reliquiae* was an unwieldy and convoluted, if ultimately faithful, version of Baxter's story.[202] Baxter's second editor, Calamy, was less concerned about being true to the contents of the manuscript as using it to tell the truth about the godly during the civil wars and Restoration.[203] Calamy's abridgment of the *Reliquiae*, published in 1702, transformed Baxter's personal story into a third-person history of the puritan movement, and included an additional long chapter detailing the suffering of Nonconforming clergymen ejected in 1662.[204] Yet if the *Abridgement* took readers far from the manuscript of the *Reliqiuae*, Calamy was more faithful than Sylvester to Baxter's interpretation of the causes of England's troubles.[205] Nonetheless, the authorial voice and narrative of the *Abridgement* was largely that of its editor, so that in what follows 'Baxter' ought to be understood as Calamy's creation.[206]

---

[200] 'William and Mary, 1688: An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certaine Lawes. [Chapter XVIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 15.]', *Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94* (1819), pp. 74-76 [http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46304. Date accessed: 06 February 2008]. For the background of slogan 'the Church in Danger' see Bennett, *Tory Crisis*, 16-20; Gibson, *The Church of England, 1688-1832*, 74-8; Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 204-6,212-16; on the perceived threat posed by Nonconformity to the Church before and after the Toleration Act see Donald A. Spaeth, *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 10, 14, 16-19, 159-72.

[201] Alexander Gordon, rev. N. H. Keeble, 'Sylvester, Matthew (1636/37-1708),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004 online edition, January 2008), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26874, accessed 6 February 2008].

Calamy's *Abridgement* covered the civil war and Interregnum period over four chapters roughly divided by subject matter: chapters four and five contained Baxter's reflections on public affairs from 1641 to 1660, and were followed by two which recounted his service to church and state over the same period.[207] Since the story of Baxter's public service was almost twice as long as the former narrative of national events it was clearly the central component of Calamy's interpretation.[208] In the brief account of the civil war two prominent themes emerged; first, that the godly—the middling sort and sober Christians—had rightly taken refuge with Parliament from the royalist aristocracy allied with the rabble, both tending towards a 'looser' sort of Christianity.[209] Justified fears for the safety of the king's Protestant subjects in the aftermath of the Irish revolt had created the irreparable breach in 1641.[210] The second theme concerned Parliament's betrayal by Cromwell, Henry Vane, and their sectarian supporters (stirred up by disguised Jesuits), who together conspired to effect the regicide. Baxter reminded readers that the ministers, including Edmund Calamy senior, 'all this Time generally Preach'd and Pray'd against Disloyalty.'[211] Serious Protestants, including future Presbyterian Nonconformists, were innocent of having caused the king's death, a point Calamy himself reiterated in a long marginal digression proving 'the Papists tho' they Acted behind the Curtain had a considerable Hand in these Commotions and their tragical issue.'[212] These themes were extended in the following chapter about the Interregnum period. Baxter again vindicated the conduct of serious Christians, emphasising, for example, the refusal of 'the Moderate Church Party and the Presbyterians' to take the Engagement of loyalty to the Commonwealth, unlike many Episcopal divines. And once more Cromwell came under Baxter's harsh judgement, the Protector's rise to power serving as a 'monitory monument or pillar to Posterity' of where sin and an 'erring deluded Judgment' might take an otherwise good man.[213]

---

[202] Richard Baxter, *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ: or, Mr. Richard Baxter's narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times. Faithfully publish'd from his own original manuscript* (London: by Matthew Sylvester printed for T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and J. Dunton, 1696). N. H. Keeble, *Richard Baxter: puritan man of letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 146. Geoffrey Nuttall prepared a tabulated list of the exact sections of the *Reliquiae* held by Dr William's Library, the British Library, and those wanting, in comparison with Matthew Sylvester's printed edition; *The Manuscript of the* Reliquiae Baxterianae (London: Dr William's Library, 1954).

[203] Richard Baxter *An abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his life and times. With an account of many others ... By Edmund Calamy. ...* (London: printed by S. Bridge, for Thomas Parkhurst. Jonathan Robinson. And John Lawrence, 1702); Keeble, *Richard Baxter*, 147; W. M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Iimperialism and the English revolution* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 79.

[204] Calamy, 'Preface,' *Abridgement*, sig. A6v; Seed, 'Dissent and the Politics of Memory,' *passim*; David L. Wykes, '"To let the Memory of these Men Dye is Injurious to Posterity": Edmund Calamy's *Account* of the Ejected Ministers' *Studies in Church History* 33 (1997), 383-84. For an argument that the *Reliquiae* was increasingly read as monument to its author's personality, and less as a vindication of his faith community, see Michael Mascuch, Michael, *The Origin of the Individual Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 101, 130.

[205] William Lamont, 'Richard Baxter, "Popery" and the origins of the English Civil War' *History*, 87 (2002), 346-48.; William Lamont, 'The religious origins of the English Civil War: two false witnesses' in David J. B. Trim and Peter J. Balderstone (eds.), *Cross, Crown & Community: Religion, Government, and Culture in Early Modern England, 1400-1800* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2004), 177-96.

[206] Keeble, *Richard Baxter*, 149.

---

[207] The first three chapters of the work concerned Baxter's life from his birth to the opening months of the Long Parliament, along with a few remarks on wider political developments in England and Scotland. On the paratactic nature of Baxter's account of national events from 1637 to 1640 see MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 153-4.

[208] Calamy, *Abridgement*, chapter iv, 'The Rise and Springs of the Civil War,' chapter v, 'Reflections on Publick Transactions,' 38-74; chapter vi, 'Mr Baxter's Conduct of himself during these Publick Commotions,' chapter vii, 'His General Usefulness,' 74-142.

[209] Baxter's analysis might thus be said to anticipate David Underdown's argument concerning the importance of rival political cultures in the origins of the civil war; for his most refined articulation of this thesis see *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 19-67.

[210] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 46-7; 41-4. MacGillivray's chiding of Baxter's attempt to exculpate a group to which he had never belonged, 'Presbyterians,' from having started the war is ultimately dependent upon the critic's own unhelpful (and anachronistic) classification of Baxter as a 'moderate Episcopalian,' *Restoration Historians*, 149, 156-7. Lamont argues that by inserting Baxter's note on the alleged commission from the king to the Catholic earl of Antrim (*Abridgement*, 43) Calamy's edition of the *Reliquiae* rightly conveyed the distinction Baxter made between the causes (*fundamentum*) and reasons (*finis*) for the civil wars. The causes were the civil controversies between the king and Parliament; the threat to godliness posed by the Irish revolt motivated him (and Cromwell) to take up arms against his sovereign; Lamont, 'Baxter and "Popery,"' 348; 'Religious Origins,' 194.

[211] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 56-8.

Calamy's aim in the chapters dealing with his subject's civil war and Interregnum public service was to demonstrate that Baxter had been a consistently prudent pastor working to restore balance in the polity: 'in Political Matters, [he] endeavour'd equally to shun the Slavish Principles of the Assertors of Absolute Monarchy, and the Confounding Notions of Democratical Projectors.'[214] For example, during Baxter's mission as a New Model army chaplain 'he set himself from Day to Day, to find out the Corruptions of the Soldiers, and to Discourse and Dispute them out of their Mistakes, both Religious and Political.'[215] Later Baxter had condemned Cromwell's usurpation 'seasonably and moderately, by Preaching and Printing,' yet without invectives that 'imprudently might irritate him to Mischief.' At the same time, the relatively inclusive Worcester Association of Ministers was the consequence of Baxter's work on behalf of Christian unity in the aftermath of the upheavals of the 1640s: 'to set all that together which was true and Good amongst them all.'[216] In Calamy's account Baxter thus became the embodiment of the principles and conduct of serious and moderate puritans during and after the civil wars, seeking godly unity in essentials, and eventually working for and welcoming the king's return, only to be expelled unjustly from the national church because he would not compromise with his conscience.[217]

---

[212] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 60-62. Calamy made reference to a number of printed works in which the innocence of dissenters was demonstrated with 'Authentick Evidence,' such as Peter Du Moulin's *Vindication* (1664, Wing D2571), which he misdated (significantly?) to 1662, William Prynne's *True and Perfect Narrative* (1659, Wing P4113 or P 4007), and Ed Pearse's *Conformists plea for the nonconformists* (1681, Wing P976/976F) 'where there is an Appendix design'd on purpose to wipe off that Aspersion.'
[213] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 62-63; 70-71.
[214] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 74.
[215] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 89.

Richard Baxter composed his *Reliquiae* after the Restoration to defend his ministry and his cause, which for him was the cause of 'catholic Christianity.'[218] Calamy's *Reliquiae* portrayed Baxter as the true representative of English Protestantism, and his doctrine the authentic *via media* for the English Church; 'in Ecclesiastical matters, [he] was equally fearful of the Arbitrary Encroachments of the Assuming Prelates, and the Uncharitable and Dividing Principles and Practices of the Sectaries.'[219] Part of Calamy's purpose was to show how the true moderate middle had been betrayed, first during the civil wars and Interregnum by the sectaries' 'Obstinate Separation,' and then after the Restoration by the established Church's 'Profane and Formal Persecutors.' Baxter's life demonstrated that for 'the sober, sound, Religious Part' of God's church, the troubled times had not ended in 1660; like Christ their experience of life under Charles I and his two sons was to be 'Crucify'd between 2 Malefactors.' [220] Therefore, blaming the civil wars on the 'looser' sort, prelates, and Irish Catholics, the regicide on popishly-deluded saints, whose schism fatally undermined Protestant unity during the Interregnum, and the expulsion of the puritan sensibility from the established Church on 'Diocesans,' were important elements of the *Abridgement's* ultimate narrative purpose, which was to give early eighteenth-century Presbyterians and Congregationalists a respectable, moderate, and rational origin story with which to refute the High Church and Tory charge that their principled separation presaged political sedition.[221] In fact, it had been forced upon them by extremists to their right and left. As true Protestants, Nonconformists deserved to be left to worship in peace, as guaranteed by the Toleration Act, and to cooperate freely with their Low Church allies in the struggle against immorality at home and the popish French interest abroad.[222]

---

[216] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 110, 118. Although Baxter was not taken in by the sectarian call for 'liberty of conscience' in the 1640s (Calamy, *Abridgement*, 53-4, 99-101), the Cromwellian church and the toleration it offered would become a kind of 'golden age' in Nonconformist memory after the Act of Uniformity in 1662; Claire Cross, 'The Church in England, 1646-1660' in G.E. Aylmer (ed.) *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London: Macmillan, 1972), 120.

[217] Keeble, *Richard Baxter*, 149. Gary S. De Krey argues that 'Reformed Protestants' in London such as Baxter and Edmund Calamy senior, fearing another 'Triumph of the Saints' were instrumental in destabilizing the restored Rump in the winter of 1659-60; *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 20-54.

[218] Keeble, *Richard Baxter*, 155. The work was evidently written in 1664-65, and 1670, but Baxter continued to bring the text 'up to date' until 1685; MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians*, 150. Baxter might also have composed the text to be read by other Nonconformists in order to encourage and sustain their faith, as Andrew Cambers argues was often the case for the authors of godly diaries, 'Andrew Cambers, 'Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580-1720' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 804-23.

[219] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 74.

Material Vindications

Two years after the publication of Calamy's *Abridgement* one of the Dissenter's Low Church allies preached a sermon whose practical applications included supporting the war against France, efforts towards greater Protestant unity in England, and the campaign to effect a reformation of manners. In themselves these points were not provocative, yet the fact that they were delivered during a Fast Day service to commemorate the execution of Charles I, and that the preacher, White Kennett, had derived them from a 'compassionate enquiry' into the causes of the civil wars which hinted at the king's culpability, turned the sermon into a public scandal.[223] To counter rumours about what he had said Kennett was compelled within weeks of preaching to have a version of his homily printed.[224] Kennett had outlined the major causes of the 'day's evil,' by which he evidently meant the civil wars and the regicide, putting most of the blame for the wars on the king's error of marrying a French Catholic queen.[225] While the wars and the king's death were indeed wicked events, a compassionate reflection upon their true origins demonstrated the benefits to the commonwealth of the Protestant Succession and maintaining the vigorous struggle against popery abroad.[226]

---

[220] Calamy, *Abridgement*, 96, 105. Calamy's wish to pass on a story of Nonconformity as a people victimized by an historic injustice, noted by Seed in 'Dissent and the Politics of Memory,' 53, clearly required him to scapegoat Baxter's sectarian and conforming opponents.

[221] Keeble, *Richard Baxter*, 147; Wyckes, 'Memory of these Men,' 381.

[222] Derek Hirst argues that Dissenters in particular, especially John Owen, played a key role in re-imagining the polity as a collection of interests; 'Bodies and Interests: Toleration and Political Imagination in the Later Seventeenth Century' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007), 417-25.

The polemicist Mary Astell sprang to the king's defence by offering the public an 'impartial inquiry' into the origins of the rebellion and civil war.[227] She countered Kennett by arguing that, as things had turned out, the French alliance and interest were as much the cause of the Glorious Revolution as the king's death.[228] Unsurprisingly, Astell shifted the blame for the wars entirely upon the king's enemies. The real guilt belonged to the 'factious and rebellious' men who had used craft and deceit to ruin the established government in church and state, to enslave the nation, and to set themselves up in power.[229] Astell's argument for the continuity in principle between the rebels, Whigs, and their Nonconformist supporters, gave her text most of its political import: 'they act upon the same Principles and Motives, and tend to the same End, who place the Supreme Power originally in the People, giving them a Right, or at least an Allowance to resume it, whenever they believe they have a sufficient Cause.'[230] She hoped that she would 'hear no more of the People's Supremacy till these Good Men have got the Act of Uniformity Repeal'd. But, alas, what do Laws signifie to Rebels, who have the Power to Break or Cunning to Evade them!'[231] A vindication of Charles I thus afforded Astell the opportunity to take swipes at both Whig political theory and Dissenters' practice of occasional conformity to get around the religious tests for public office.

---

[223] White Kennett, *A compassionate enquiry into the causes of the Civil War. In a sermon preached in the church of St. Botolph Algate, on January XXXI, 1703/4* ... (London: printed and sold by H. Hills, 1704). On the self-perception of clergymen as preachers encouraging public debate see Tony Claydon, 'The sermon, the "public sphere" and the political culture of late seventeenth century England' in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 218-27

[224] Kennett, *Compassionate enquiry*, 16. Of course, it can be argued that once his sermon was printed a preacher lost even more authority over the meaning of his scriptural interpretation, and of what he had really said; James Rigney, '"To lye upon a Stationers stall, like a piece of coarse flesh in a Shambles": the sermon, print and the English Civil War' in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.) *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 200-203.

[225] Kennett, *Compassionate enquiry*, 4, 6.

[226] Kennett went on to write the third volume of John Hughes's compilation *The Complete History of England* (London: Brab. Aylmer, 1706), which covered the seventeenth century.

[227] Mary Astell, *An impartial enquiry into the causes of rebellion and civil war in this kingdom: In an examination of Dr. Kennett's sermon, Jan. 31. 1703/4. And Vindication of the Royal Martyr* (London printed by E. P. for R. Wilkin, 1704). Ruth Perry argues that although Astell is known largely through her polemical literature she was foremost a philosopher, particularly a critic of Lockean empirical and materialist epistemology; 'Mary Astell and Enlightenment', in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor (eds.), *Women, Gender, and Enlightenment* (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 365.

---

[228] Astell, *Impartial enquiry*, 38-9. Near the conclusion she asked how a cleric of the Church of England could follow in the footsteps of Hugh Peters and Samuel Rutherford and blame—in print—the wars on the sins of the king in print; 58.

[229] Astell, *Impartial enquiry*, 40-42, 9. Astell's historiography is feminist, William Kolbrener argues, in so far as her critique of marriage, founded on a woman being misled into matrimony by a man's deceitful speech, is reflected in her argument that the people were seduced into rebelling against the king by Pym and the rest of the parliamentary Junto's 'fancies;' William Kolbrener, 'Gendering the Modern: Mary Astell's Feminist Historiography' *The Eighteenth Century* 44 (2003), 18.

[230] Astell, *Impartial enquiry*, 48. She quoted extensively from two tracts by Henry Foulis, *The history of Romish treasons and usurpations* (London : Printed for Thomas Basset, Richard Chiswell, Christopher Wilkinson, and Thomas Dring, 1681), and his *History of the wicked plots and conspiracies of our pretended saints* (Oxford: Henry Hall, 1674), to show that the 'deposing doctrine' held by Whigs and Dissenters was 'rank popery' and held anathema by the reformed Church of England; 23-29.

[231] Astell, *Impartial enquiry*, 35. Patricia Springborg contends that Astell made Kennett a surrogate for Locke and the 'basic tenets of Whig political theory' underlying the Revolution settlement. Astell, she argues, perceived the threat of the French alliance, popery, and tyranny as exaggerated Whig hype and justifications for excluding the Stuarts from the throne; *Mary Astell: Theorist of Freedom from Domination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 143-63.

Kennett's Fast Day sermon and Astell's tract reiterate this chapter's central argument that printed post-Revolution historical writing narrated the civil wars and Interregnum to help the reading public identify the guilty and innocent parties from the broken past in order to attack or to defend the Revolution settlement and status quo. Telling the story of the troubled times in a manner which echoed the proceedings of the king's trial did not signify an unconscious 'parallel processing' of the past; instead, it reflected the common belief that the truth about what had been done—the facts—was ultimately bound up with the truth about what was, is, and will always be, right and wrong.[232] The works which this chapter has considered were firmly within the Renaissance paradigm of history as an explanatory narrative of the past which would guide right thinking and conduct in the future.[233] This understanding of history's purpose was even more important, however, in the first age of party, since the public was increasingly called upon, and evoked in partisan discourse, to judge questions concerning the national interest.[234] Telling stories in the hope of settling the question of blame for the troubles was therefore an essential component of the polemical strategy whereby communities of principle aligned themselves with the true present interest of the nation, and identified their opponents as historic public enemies.

It is thus not surprising that for Kennett and Astell, and the other authors or compliers highlighted above, the question of historical guilt for the troubled times was inextricably connected to the question of the greatest present danger to the post-

---

[232] According to Eelco Runia, parallel processes are sub-conscious re-enactments of past events; '"Forget About It": "Parallel Processing" in the Srebrenica Report' *History and Theory*, 43 (2004), 295-320.
[233] Rüsen, History, 12-4; Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, 26-7; D. R. Kelley, 'The Theory of History' in Quentin Skinner and Eckhard Kessler (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 746-61.
[234] Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 51-7 and 98-99; 'History and Literature,' 7.

Revolution polity. Wrong actions in the past had been caused by immoral principles; those in the present who still adhered to them represented the possibility of renewed upheaval and rupture. Revolutionary vindicators defended the settlement hammered out in 1689, and the Protestant succession, from the danger posed by a Jacobite restoration by blaming, in the case of Seller, Welwood, Coke, and Jones, the Stuart dynasty in general, or, as Toland did blatantly and Kennett did gently, Charles I in particular. Calamy justified the post-Revolution religious settlement in his version of Baxter's memoir by blaming prelatical Protestants and sectaries for derailing the hopes of godly reformation and Protestant unity in the face of popery. This was scapegoating to defend the good that had been achieved since 1689, and to prove that the danger of civil war loomed from attempts to undermine it. Late in the 1690s Radical Whigs argued that the public was in danger from the corrupting influence of a standing army, and vindicated republican political theory, by hitching earlier personal stories vilifiying the New Model army to contemporary concerns about the Junto Whig's betrayal of the Revolution's promise. Tory vindicators, for their part, critiqued the post-Revolution polity by taking up the cause of the royal martyr, and his Church, by again showing how religion and concern for liberty had sufficiently masked the animus of the godly towards the Elizabethan religious settlement and their naked will to power to overthrow the establishment and kill the best of kings. This was scapegoating to highlight what had gone wrong since James II's flight, and to prove the danger of another conflagration posed by 'Revolution principles.'[235]

Partisan rivalry encouraged division within the public over the greatest potential source of danger to the commonwealth. Along with the fictional impulse which partisan discourse encouraged in later Stuart political culture, scholars need to give heed to the scapegoating imperative within the period's historical culture.[236] Vindicatory historical writing handed over to the present and to posterity stories that conveyed the identity of the guilty and the innocent for the sake of identifying the real defenders, and genuine enemies, of the public good. The conspiratorial mindset evident in much of the era's political discourse stemmed not only from fears over the ability of language to misrepresent, but also from firm notions of inherited collective responsibility and potential to do good and ill.[237] The continuity across time of actual and potential wrong was established in two ways: first, by biological descent, as in the Stuart dynasty and the children of puritans; second, by adherence to principles, such as the need for religious uniformity, or the right of subjects to resist tyrants. In both instances, civil war histories were populated by characters that functioned as historical anti-types of partisan rivals at the turn of the eighteenth century. Furthermore, vindicatory histories reinforced the honour and credibility of their innocent protagonists' descendants by highlighting the implausibility and notoriety of their guilty antagonists' ancestors. The Tory party's reputation could be bolstered by public reminders of the role of Nonconformists in the regicide, or the wickedness of Whig political theories. On the other side, Whigs might enhance their status by recounting the disasters accompanying the tenure of the Stuarts, admittedly more difficult after 1702 than before.

---

[235] Springborg, *Mary Astell*, xiv-xv; for Astell the danger of civil unrest similar to 1642 or 1649 was enhanced because of the 1689 Revolution.

---

[236] The problem of truth and fiction in the age of party is analyzed in Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 272-334. For the importance of blaming mechanisms in the formation of culture see René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, Translated by Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), and *The Scapegoat*, Translated by Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).

[237] Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 29.

While civil war historians continued to believe in the unity of what was done with what was right, their stories which exonerated and condemned contributed to doubts about the truth of past, the sense that what really had happened might not, indeed, be concomitant with what was good, what was right, and which party genuinely represented the greatest danger to the public.[238] If by the beginning of the eighteenth century there was a consensus over the memorable moments of the nation's past, narrating the civil wars to vindicate and to vilify its protagonists, to distinguish true principles from those which were false, and to highlight the difference between rival groups in the present, confirmed the mid seventeenth century as a moment in England's historical memory the remembering and narrating of which fostered public division and disagreement, even as the last old Cavaliers and Roundheads fell to dust.[239]

Published historical writings told the stories about the past to enable future readers to remember both what had happened and what those former events meant for their own time.[240] The next chapter will turn to a sample of unpublished manuscripts—letters to John Walker—whose composers had sought out testimonies about the troubled times in the hopes of helping make public an Anglican response to the *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, Edmund Calamy's history of the origins of Restoration Nonconformity. Like civil war histories published after 1696, the letters sent to Exeter clergyman John Walker narrated accounts of the broken past to vindicate and to condemn contemporary political positions. Additionally, the stories of Anglican martyrdom during the wars conveyed in Walker's correspondence were intended to bear witness the true Christian character of the established church in an age of limited religious pluralism. It is to the material products of multiple quests for genuine testimonies of true Christian suffering, posted to John Walker as evidence for his projected published history of the Anglican martyrs, to which the final chapter turns.

---

[238] Here I am echoing Knights, 'Tory Interpretation of History,' 359-63.

[239] On the emergence of 'British history' in tandem with the (eventual) triumph of written and printed over oral sources of knowledge about the past see Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 294-8.

[240] Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 144-5.

VII.

Memories of the true martyrs: witnessing to Anglican civil war suffering in letters to John Walker, 1704-5.

This chapter analyzes the creation of and stories about Anglican suffering during the civil wars and Interregnum contained within a portion of the correspondence received by Reverend John Walker in 1704-5. The first section considers the letters as material witness of earlier oral testimonies about the troubled past; the second part analyses the accounts of puritan persecutions of loyal clergy during the wars, and the contemporary religious significance of these narratives. These letters were epistolarly martyrologies that witnessed to the genuine sufferers for true faith during the seventeenth century; they demonstrated their authors' conviction that a published history of Anglican martyrdom would vindicate the truth of the Church's confession and its position as the nation's public religion.

*

In 1704 the rector of Kilmington in Somerset received a letter from Richard Clark of nearby Penselwood. This epistle contained what Clark called 'a true narrative of 2 eminent persons whose sufferings ought not I thinke to be raked up in the Ashes of Oblivion.' The story Clark related concerned two clergymen, Thomas Caffin and Richard Fitzherbert, who had endured mistreatment and imprisonment in the 1640s and 1650s. The accounts of Caffin and Fitzherbert had come to Clark from three elderly men of Meare, one of whom had been Caffin's servant. Clark's other informants related the same story to him 'taking it from the mouths of their progenitors.' Caffin, the rector of Fovent and vicar of Meare in Wiltshire, was 'barbarously abused' by 'Oliverian soldiers,' and died from grief after they plundered his house and stable. Soldiers had also plundered the property of Fitzherbert, then the Archdeacon of Dorset, several times. On one memorable occasion the troops were led by Fitzherbert's brother in law, Colonel Fay, who had hoped at the time 'to make him an example to deter the rest of his brethren the Cavalliers.'[1]

Some time after receiving Clark's letter, Hill sent it to John Walker of Exeter, a fellow clergyman who was collecting epistles with similar stories about events half a century earlier.[2] These documents have been used previously for the light they shed on mid-seventeenth-century religious and social history, particularly the experience of clerical families and wives during the wars.[3] More recently, Burke Griggs has shown how the letters fit somewhat uncomfortably into Walker's agenda for an empirical history of puritan persecutions.[4] Walker's correspondence has not, however, been studied as a particular way of remembering the past, nor have the stories conveyed within the letters been analyzed for their contemporary political and religious implications.[5] The following chapter is based on a reading of the first two hundred letters collected by Walker or his associates, all written in 1704 or 1705.[6] As in the examples of testimonies and histories already discussed, these letters and the stories within them were prompted by particular aspects of the national political context, and were profoundly shaped by the social settings of their creation. Walker's correspondents sought out testimonies about the sufferings of the clergy, and wrote them up as stories in their letters to overcome distances both of space and of time, that is, to hand over to Walker and then to posterity the truth about events which had almost slipped entirely from personal memory.[7] At the same time, the letters conveyed stories of Anglican suffering to reaffirm the established Church's position in the more competitive religious arena created by the Toleration Act. The epistolary martyrologies which men such as Richard Clark posted to Walker were intended ultimately to remind the public in an age of religious toleration that the nation's spiritual bearings ought to derive from the genuine English Church. The truth about the civil war past to which the letters witnessed was therefore fundamentally religious.[8]

---

[1] This material is drawn from the letter of Richard Clark to Hill of Kilmington, (no date) now part of the Walker papers at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Bodl. Lib.) MS J Walker c 1, f. 139 and f. 188.
[2] Parliament's various campaigns against clerics whom local Committees regarded as delinquents, and some of the reasons for the sequestrations during the civil wars, are outlined by I. M. Green in 'The persecution of "scandalous" and "malignant" parish clergy during the English Civil War' *English Historical Review* (1979), 507-31.
[3] Ann Laurence, '"This Sad and Deplorable Condition:" An attempt towards recovering an account of the sufferings of Northern clergy families in the 1640s and 1650s" in Diana Wood (ed.), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church c. 1000 – c. 1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross* (Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, Boydell Press, 1999), 465-88; and "'Begging pardon for all mistakes or errors in this writing I being a woman and doing it myself:" Family narratives in some eighteenth-century letters' in James Daybell (ed.) *Early Modern Women's Letter-Writing, 1450-1700* (London: Palgrave, 2001), 194-206.
[4] Burke Griggs, 'Remembering the Puritan Past: John Walker and Anglican Memories of the English Civil War' in M.C. McClendon, J.P. Ward, and M. MacDonald (eds.) *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 158-91.
[5] See the plea from Paulina Kewes in 'History and Its Uses: Introduction' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 10-11, for students of early modern British historical writing to include religious historiography in their analysis.

Martyrological challenge and reaction

The chapter begins with a brief overview of the established Church's position in the post-Revolution political arena in 1704 as a prelude for understanding the reaction among many conforming clergy to the publication of Calamy's *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, widely perceived as a kind of Nonconformist martyrology. The importance of martyrology within English Protestantism will then be outlined, followed by a discussion of the origin of the Walker's quest to answer Calamy with a history of Anglican suffering based largely on the testimonies of first or second-hand witnesses. The section ends with a consideration of Walker's suggestions for determining genuine testimony concerning events five or six decades past.

---

[6] While the first one hundred letters—the first century—came from across the country, those from the 'second century' were largely from Walker's native county of Devon.

[7] Gary Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 16.

[8] John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The history of a relationship' in John R. Ellis (ed.) *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994, 3-24; see David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National memory and Protestant culture in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), on the importance of public commemorations for the formation of religious and national identity in early modern England. For a similar process among Protestants in Ireland see Toby Barnard, 'The uses of 23 October and Irish Protestant Celebrations' *English Historical Review* (1991), 789-820.

The symbiotic connection between Church and crown, which James II's policies beginning in 1686 had sundered, had not been repaired under the rule of William and Mary.[9] Much to the chagrin of many conforming clergymen, the Glorious Revolution resulted in freedom of worship for Protestant Nonconformists, the advent of a national Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland, and the expulsion of four hundred non-jurors who refused to swear allegiance to the new monarchs. During the 1690s the episcopacy was filled by lukewarm latitudinarians such as Gilbert Burnet and Thomas Tenison, and the Church's political enemies, the Whigs, often dominated the king's counsels.[10] Many clergymen were also anxious about the increasing threats posed by 'heretical' doctrines and the Dissenters' academies.[11] Thus, the accession of the new Queen Anne in 1702, a firm defender of the Church's interest, was understandably perceived as a second

---

[9] The political, religious, and military consequences of the Glorious Revolution are surveyed in Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s, Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1999). On the Revolution itself see the essays in J.I Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and Roland Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), 171-92.

[10] On the position of the Church of England after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 see G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975); William Gibson, *The Church of England, 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, (London: Routledge, 2001); John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714* (Harlow: Longman, 2006), 193-234.

[11] See Donald A. Spaeth, *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 10-19, for an introduction to clerical fears about Nonconforming Protestants after 1660; John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor 'Introduction' in John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Church of England c. 1689 – c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 13-22.

Restoration.[12] After more than a decade of repeated prorogations the Convocation of Canterbury province started meeting regularly; and Church-friendly Tories such as Lord Rochester dominated the Queen's government.[13] The concerns of Churchmen were prominent in Parliament from 1702 to 1705; for example three bills were introduced to outlaw the practice of 'occasional conformity,' by which moderate dissenters took Anglican Communion once a year to meet the religious demands of the Corporation Act (1661).[14]

Such was the political and religious context in which Edmund Calamy published his *Abridgement* of Richard Baxter's memoirs, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, in 1702.[15] Baxter had been a well-known representative of English Nonconforming clergy, men who had lost their livings in 1662 because they could not conform to the Act of Uniformity in 1662. Calamy's *Abridgement* contained a chapter which gave the names and brief biographies of the ejected ministers. Calamy's purpose in compiling this list was at least three-fold; first, to affirm the continuity of Dissenters living after the Toleration Act with their Restoration-era predecessors; second, to show that Nonconforming ministers were not seditious but truly loyal to the crown; third, to appropriate for Nonconforming Protestants the honour of having witnessed to the truth of their faith through suffering and persecution.[16] In other words, the ejections and travails of Dissenting ministers demonstrated that theirs was a true church.

---

[12] Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 268.

[13] Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (Revised Edition London: Hambledon, 1987); J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); W.A. Speck, *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation, 1700-1710*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994); and Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

[14] Holmes, *British Politics*, 97-103; Hoppitt, *Land of Liberty*, 231.

[15] Richard Baxter *An abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his life and times. With an account of many others ... By Edmund Calamy. ...* (London: printed by S. Bridge, for Thomas Parkhurst. Jonathan Robinson. And John Lawrence, 1702). W. M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the millennium: protestant imperialism and the English revolution* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979); N. H. Keeble, *Richard Baxter: puritan man of letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); David L. Wykes, '"To let the Memory of these Men Dye is Injurious to Posterity": Edmund Calamy's *Account* of the Ejected Ministers' *Studies in Church History*, 33 (1997), 383.

Writings which recorded and celebrated women and men who died for the sake of Christian truth were profoundly important within England's religious culture during and after the Reformation.[17] Most famously, John Foxe's *Act and Monuments* related the interaction of God's providence and the martyrs' heroic testimony from the earliest days of Christianity down to the burnings of the godly under Queen Mary.[18] These stories provided English readers with evidence of popish persecution and Protestant suffering for the truth faith which, when they were read and remembered, reaffirmed the readers' sense of belonging to a national religious community separate and distinct from the false 'Romish' church.[19] In a similar fashion John Temple's account of the atrocities committed by Irish Catholics against Protestant settlers in 1641, first published as *The Irish Rebellion* in 1646, urged English readers to remember the perfidy of their Celtic neighbours and God's efforts in those dark times to rescue the faithful.[20] Temple's martyrology eventually became the received version of events in Ireland during the autumn of 1641, thus transforming historical writing into personal memory.[21] By contrast, a group of concerned conforming clergy decided to respond to Calamy's martyrology by converting testimonies of suffering for the truth into a published history.

---

[16] Wykes, 'Memory,' 387; John Seed, 'History and Narrative: Religious dissent and the politics of memory in eighteenth-century England' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 46-63. I was reminded of the third point by Stephen Taylor.

[17] Bradley S. Gregory *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 2-5.

[18] Patrick Collinson, 'Truth and legend : the veracity of John Foxes Book of Martyrs' in A.C. Duke and C.A. Tasme (eds.) *In Clio's Mirror. Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*, (Leiden, Brill, 1985), 31-54; Thomas S. Freeman, 'Fate, faction, and fiction in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*'. *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 606-24; David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Adlershot: Ashgate, 1997). For discussions of martyrs and martyrdom in early modern English literature see John R. Knott, *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and Susannah Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[19] Glyndwr Parry, 'Elect church or elect nation? The reception of *Acts and Monuments*' in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Adlershot: Ashgate, 1997), 167-81; Thomas S. Freeman argues that Foxe's conception of a martyr as one who dies for the truth became dominant among English Protestants and Catholics; 'Introduction: Over their Dead Bodies: Concepts of Martyrdom in Late-Medieval and Early-Modern England' Thomas Mayer and Thomas Freeman (eds.), *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 20-27.

[20] Kathleen M. Noonan, 'Martyrs in Flames: Sir John Temple and the Conception of the Irish in English Martyrologies' *Albion* (2004), 223-55.

In 1703 Dr Charles Goodall of London conceived the idea of a book that would render an 'account of the Clergy of the Church of England who suffered by Sequestration, Imprisonment, Banishment, Death etc. in Defence of the Religion, Laws and Liberties of their Country, and for loyalty for their Martyr'd Sovereign…and a faithful account of their persecutions.'[22] Goodall sponsored the notice in the *London Gazette* in March 1704 announcing the proposed history. That the plan struck a chord is evident in a letter to Goodall from John Gilbert, the son of a loyal minister from Staffordshire; Gilbert was 'extremely pleased' to learn that 'in this malicious Trimming age there are some Publique spirited people that will do Justice to the memory of the old suffering Cavaliers.'[23] The grandson of a sufferer, and former Tory propagandist, John Northleigh agreed that a book concerning 'our Persecuted Clergy,' would demonstrate the 'miserable and suffering state of the Church of England, A primitive Test of the most Antient and Christian [church].'[24]

At approximately the same time as Goodall's plan became public, the rector of St Mary Major in Exeter, John Walker, wrote to White Kennett indicating that he also planned to write an 'account of the numbers and sufferings of the loyal clergy.'[25] Walker soon assumed direction over the project of collecting and publishing from Goodall, which ended up spanning a decade.[26] Walker continued Goodall's method of appealing to the public for information about the clergy during the wars and Interregnum, but channelled his efforts through the Church's hierarchy. Much like an antiquarian or natural historian, Walker distributed *Queries*, a list of questions requiring answers, to Archdeacons whom he hoped would forward them to the clergy under their supervision.[27] The first *Queries* were issued in 1704 and were directed primarily at clerics within the diocese of Exeter. It was three pages and nearly fifteen hundred words long, and requested detailed information about a potential correspondent's civil war predecessor or ancestor.[28] Not only were the name of the suffering clergyman and nature of the hardships requested, but whether 'he was abused by soldiers, interrupted during divine service, what his sufferings were after his ejection, the manner his replacement came in, his character, pedigree, opinions, outrageous actions or words, and the character and identity of the powers who were behind the deed,' among other questions.[29]

---

[21] Noonan, 'Martyrs,' 251-2.

[22] G. B. Tatham, *Dr John Walker and* The Sufferings of the Clergy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 11.

[23] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 90.

[24] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 267; c. 1, f. 356. Northleigh had composed a pamphlet during the Exclusion crisis in which he compared the Protestant Association sponsored by the earl of Shaftesbury to the Solemn League and Covenant; *The parallel: or, The new specious association an old rebellious covenant. Closing with a disparity between a true patriot, and a factious associator* (London: B. Tooke, 1682). Andrew M. Coleby, 'Northleigh, John (1656/7–1705),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004, online edition) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20331, accessed 11 March 2008]

Because Walker wanted to catalogue true accounts of genuine Christian martyrs, he was very clear about the kinds of sources that he considered to be acceptable. He asked potential correspondents to make use of primary documents: writings or published works by the suffering cleric, papers, proceedings, or journals left behind by the Commissioners for sequestration. He wanted to be informed of any secondary sources, such as 'account books, pamphlets, or Parts of Books and Histories, which treat of the Sufferings of the Clergy in those Times.' Walker also recognized that many of his informants would seek information from 'the Antient People of your Parishes, the Relations or Descendants of such as were concerned in those Times (especially any Relations and Descendants of their own, or their intimate Acquaintance and Friends) and Learned Gentlemen in your Parish.' Since his goal was to collect authentic stories of sufferers for the truth, it is no surprise that he asked his correspondents to 'set down the Names and Qualities of the Person from whom you have your Relations, as from a Son, a Friend, a Brother, etc. of the Minister himself; Or whatever else the Relator's Condition may be that renders his Testimony credible: And to send nothing but what you have good Grounds to believe is true.'[30] Walker clearly believed that a story about the past was true, or at least credible, the closer an informant was to the suffering minister. He was also concerned about the 'quality' of potential sources. True testimony about sufferers for the truth was therefore founded both on a witness's competence and on his or her credibility.[31]

---

[25] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 46. It is perhaps doubtful that Walker would have written Kennett had Walker's project commenced after the publication of Kennett's notorious *Compassionate Enquiry*.
[26] Tatham, *Walker*, 16. John Walker, *An attempt towards recovering an account of the numbers and suffering of the clergy of the Church of England ... scholars, etc., who were sequester'd, harrass'd, etc., in the late times of the Grand Rebellion, etc.* (London: J. Nicholson, 1714).
[27] Woolf, *Social Circulation*, 159. The use of circulated queries to gain geographic knowledge of western Scotland is explored in C. Withers, 'Reporting, Mapping, Trusting: making geographical knowledge in the late seventeenth-century,' *Isis* 90 (1999), 503-4.
[28] The second version of the *Queries* which dates from 1705 was much shorter than the first; it was one half-sheet with fewer than three hundred words. This edition of the *Queries* might have been abbreviated to reduce costs, since Walker wanted it sent throughout the land.
[29] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 325-326.

---

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] For an argument on the importance of personal expertise in the development of empirical approaches to history and natural philosophy see Barbara Shapiro, A *Culture of the Fact: England, 1550-1720* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000). Steven Shapin, by contrast, argues that social credit, particularly the disinterested ethos of a gentleman, was more important for the construction of credible scientific knowledge; *The Social History of Truth: civility and science in seventeenth-century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

Material and living testaments to the sufferers

This section of the chapter concerns the material and living sources which correspondents used to compose their letters with stories of clerical suffering: printed materials and manuscripts, personal memory and oral testimony. Particular attention is given to the language letter writers used to convince Walker that their sources, and thus their stories about the civil war past, were trustworthy testimony.

Only a very small number of Walker's early correspondents indicated that they had consulted printed sources. The letter from Richard Score suggested that Walker seek out 'Mr Princes Worthies of Devon Page 345' for 'a true account of the Sufferings of one Mr Arthur Giffard (minister of Bideford) in Cromwel's time.'[32] John Northleigh could, perhaps with a measure of pride, note that an account of his maternal grandfather's suffering had twice made it into print, 'first…in one large sheet, entitled A General Bill of Mortality of the Clergy of London from 1641 to 1647 or The Mercurius Rusticus where with the same it is reprinted again in 1685.'[33] There was nothing in any of the letters to suggest that a correspondent had made use of one or several of the royalist martyrologies published after the Restoration, such as James Heath's *New Book of Loyal English Martyrs* (1665), William Winstanley's *The Loyal Martyrology* (1665), or David Lloyd's *Memoirs of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings* (1668). This lack of reference to earlier published anthologies of loyal sufferers might be because these works did not feature the people about whom correspondents wished to write, or else that they were not available to the authors of these particular letters.

---

[32] The work to which Score refers is John Prince, *Danmonii Orientalis Illustris; or, the worthies of Devon*, (Exeter: Sam. Farley, 1701).
[33] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 315; c. 1, f. 356.

A larger selection of correspondents made reference to manuscripts surviving from the 1640s or 1650s. The vicar of Egg Buckland in Devon began his letter by stating that he had 'examined into the antient books of the said parish.' Thomas Rowell described the character of his ejected predecessor using 'some books and Papers written by his own hand which were preserved and delivered down to his successors.'[34] James Turner guessed that Mr William Richardson was turned out from Garthorp, Leicester, in 1644 or 1645 'by the discontinuance of my Register then.' Anthony Pikkes's information was gleaned wholly from his parish Register, while by contrast George Child of Rutland depended for half of his account on what he could read in the register of Barradon.[35] As Gideon Edmond discovered, however, documents from the late troubles could also reveal information which Walker might prefer not to know. It appeared that Edmond's predecessor, Thomas Bradford, was unmolested during the troubles thanks to the intervention of William Morrice, a member of Devon's commission of the peace throughout the 1640s and 1650s who was rewarded for his services to his kinsman George Monck in 1660 with the post of Secretary of State.[36] Edmond had found a copy of a letter to Morrice requesting a loan of £5 'among some loose papers left in this House,' and although he recognized that this information 'rather crosses than answers the purpose of the queries,' Edmond wrote that he could hardly ignore something that had come 'so full in my way.'[37] Edmond's hesitation was perhaps prompted by his distaste for

---

[34] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 225.

[35] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 208; c. 1, f. 233; c. 1, f. 265.

[36] Paul Seaward, 'Morice, Sir William (1602–1676),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004, online edition), [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19255, accessed 6 March 2008].

[37] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 294; c. 2, f. 287.

Morrice's apparently self-serving support for the Restoration in 1660, which Walker echoed himself by writing on the letter '[s]ee such as had friends thro' bribery kept in.'[38] Walker's quest for information about true sufferers during the wars therefore brought to light facts which he probably would have preferred to forget, such as the important role that 'new Cavaliers' such as Morrice played in bringing about the miracle of the king's return.[39]

A small number of Walker's correspondents, primarily the children of clergy, could still remember the troubled times.[40] For example, William Satterly wrote that 'I (being a child in those times) can give you but a slender account of his usages from my own memory,' yet went on to say 'I have heard him often complaine of his imprisonment.' Similarly Robert Bowber concluded his letter concerning his father's ejection by declaring that 'I have given you a true account to the best of my knowledge and remembrance.'[41] A letter with an account derived from past experience might also come from a minister's larger kinship network or acquaintances. John James, the godson of an ejected clergyman, claimed that he could still remember 'the virulent Presbyterian' who had done his godfather wrong. One man even wrote that he still recalled meeting an ejected minister 'about the 1643.'[42] The information in these letters was perhaps the closest Walker would get to the lived experience of the sufferers.

A larger portion of correspondents could not personally remember what had happened to loyal clergy but nonetheless had learned about it from the sufferers' own mouths. For example, several daughters of clergymen, such as Elizabeth Trosse and Elizabeth Bentham, wrote lengthy reports based upon such first-hand testimony.[43] Trosse's three-page letter was, she declared, 'the best account I could [get] of my father's troubles,' being based upon 'the best recollection I can make of what I have heard my father and mother say concerning those matters.'[44] She apologized for writing what was a relatively longer epistle, possibly to minimize the risk that Walker would not credit her account.[45] Although the number of female correspondents in Walker's first two hundred letters is too small to make generalizations about the role of gender in the style and content of their letters, it seems from her apology that Elizabeth Trosse believed it was more 'polite' for a woman to write less than might be expected from a man.[46] By contrast, when male composers apologized in letters it tended to be for not including enough information. In her study of Walker's letters, Ann Laurence found that women tended to focus their narratives on the abuse and hardships experienced by a minister's wife and children, ~~while~~ men were more concerned to relate the loss of status and honour suffered by the clergy.[47] Nevertheless, since all correspondents were interested in conveying stories that proved their spiritual forbearers had suffered for their faith, and that accounts of the travails of faithful women could be expected to excite the reader's pity, it is not surprising that men also wrote about instances of female suffering.[48]

---

[38] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 287.
[39] I owe this point to J. R. Jones.
[40] These correspondents thus drew their information directly from an aggregate fund of lived experience, or what Avishai Margalit calls 'common memory; *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 51.
[41] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 245; c. 2, f. 231.
[42] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 333 and f. 204.

---

[43] I was able to identify four female composers from the first two hundred letters sent to Walker. A number of anonymous letters which include stories of violence against women, or the defiance of a minister's wife toward her persecutors, may well have been written by women, such as c. 1, f. 264, 'Anonymous letter from Rutland.'

[44] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 340.

[45] Francis King also apologized for her 'mistakes or errors in this writing I being a woman and doeing itt myself.' Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 28v.

[46] An introduction to the relationship between letter writing style and social relations in the sixteenth century, drawing on the insights of 'politeness theory,' is in Lynne Magnusson, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 92-3.

[47] Laurence, 'Sad and Deplorable Condition;' 'Begging Pardon for my Mistakes,' 201. Examples from the sampled correspondence include accounts about abuse suffered by pregnant wives from two female informants, Ann Harris and 'a virtuous Gentlewoman,' and Frances King's story of her mother's miscarriage brought on by a sequestrator; these will be explored more fully below. This lends support to Daniel Woolf's point that the family was at the centre of female understandings of the past, either as a subject itself or as a lens through which to make sense of broader events; 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800' *American Historical Review* 102 (1997), 655.

The majority of Walker's correspondents learned about the travails of loyal ministers from the testimony of people who had known the clergy or heard about their sufferings during the wars. The grandson of a sufferer, Hugh Chase, declared that what he wrote about his ancestor was only 'what I best know myself, and am informed by his friends and near relations now living.' For several correspondents the descendents of the clergy served as their sources. A daughter of Samuel Ware 'now living in Ashcomb' gave Elias Carter an account of her father's suffering and death.[49] The information that Thomas Hickes had concerning German Goldeston was 'pick't up from the only surviving Relick' of his predecessor, who was now 'wife of one Mr Glanvill a saddler in Plymouth.'[50] Second-hand testimony also came from elderly members of a parish. A rector from the diocese of Leicester, Peter Phelips, sent Walker 'an account of the violences done to one of my predecessors, given by the parishioners to me, some of which are yet living, and divers of the neighbours can testify the same.' George Child's information came from 'some ancient persons now living who remember what was then done.'[51] The letter from Thomas Byrdall opened with him declaring that 'all the Information I can get with respect to your severall queries' came from 'the mouths of some ancient People, who liv'd in the said Parish during the late usurpation, and perfectly remember that Part which Dunsford bears in the History of those Times.'[52] Walker's enterprise was thus the occasion for turning the memories of elderly women and men into written records.[53]

---

[48] For example, John Gilbert from Warwickshire claimed his predecessor's wife, refusing to leave her home, had her hands torn as she hung on to the parsonage door; Bold. Lib. MS J Walker, c. 2, f. 15v. I owe the point about exciting pity to Sylvia Brown.
[49] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 367; c.2 f. 233.
[50] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 259; c. 2, f. 337.
[51] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 161; c.1, f. 265.

Although first- and second-hand testimony was a crucial source for true knowledge about what had happened to the clergy during the wars, it was widely acknowledged to be diminishing, and a somewhat problematic, type of evidence. Many letter writers recognized that the more time passed between the civil wars and the present, fewer and fewer people remained who could remember those days from personal experience, making it all the more difficult to recover the full extent of the sufferings wrought by puritan persecutors. Thus one correspondent, Edward Bradford, claimed that if Walker had started his project two decades earlier, Bradford would have had a much a much richer fund of personal memories upon which to draw. 'I had then,' he wrote, 'divers very aged persons, of 80 years and upwards living in my parish in the times of Confusion.'[54] Writing in May 1705, Stamford Wallace likewise noted that 'at this distance of tyme, the memories of those great men which that wicked crew turned out, is almost forgot and also the intruders too.' M. Strong and Humphrey Prideaux were both somewhat apologetic when writing to Walker, the former stating that his letter contained 'all the account that at this great distance of time I can get,' while the latter confessed that 'on inquiry [he found] all things of this nature so forgotten after 60 years elapsed that I can recover nothing worth informing you.'[55] Furthermore, the recollections of ancient people were not always complete. William Beetham admitted that his account derived from the testimony of a man who had 'lived in that sad time, and was a spectator of those affairs… [but] time has worn some things out of his memory.'[56] While on the one hand the passing of time had thus increased the value of testimony by reducing the available stock of witnesses, it had also heightening the risk that what they remembered was partial or perhaps even untrue.

---

[52] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 139; c. 2, f. 235.
[53] For a similar phenomenon prompted by disputes over ancient customary rights see Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England: 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 259-97.
[54] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2., f. 296.
[55] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 211; c. 1, f. 172; c. 2, f. 148.

The fact that Walker's correspondents recognized that the authenticity and authority of his projected history of suffering clergy was crucially connected to the credibility of their accounts, and the testimonies upon which they were based, is evident from their efforts to convince Walker that their sources and their stories were reliable. A number of letter-writers related details about their informants and how their knowledge had been acquired. Charles Curties, for example, insisted to Walker that 'that which I send you is what has bin communicated to me by two worthy Gent. and an honest Farmer, whose testimonies may be well depended upon, they being intimately acquainted with my suffering Episcopal predecessor.'[57] Thomas Gipps concluded his epistle with the declaration that 'the Account I here give you I rec'd from Robert Barlow husbandman aged 72; from Elizabeth Meadowcraft aged 76; and from Elizabeth Kay of Cobbs aged about 80 years.'[58] Particularly thorough in identifying an informant was the Suffolk minister Isaac Raye, who identified his source, Edward Elliston, gave his age, and had Elliston put his signature on the document.[59] The deductive work of John Evans was truly remarkable. He claimed to have travelled to two nearby parishes to interview the 'two men living that can speak to this barbarity of their own knowledge.' He averred that he had 'examined them apart about the matter of fact, and tho' they knew nothing of me or my Design yet they both agreed in their testimony.'[60]

---

[56] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 401.
[57] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1 f. 320.
[58] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 244
[59] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 228; c. 2, f. 97.

The truth of Walker's projected history of civil war Anglican clergy who suffered for their faith was therefore largely dependent upon the trustworthiness of the stories conveyed by his correspondents, which in turn were derived from the testimonies of their informants. Evans's efforts suggest that he, like Walker, regarded an informant's personal experience and his reputation as fundamental to the veracity of their testimony.[61] These standards of knowledge and credit also were applied by letter-writers to their own stories.[62] Particularly conscientious was Edward Voyer, who included on his letter a signed attestation from Francis Hutchinson, declaring that 'Mr Voyer of Okley is now an Antient clergyman of great learning and sobriety and I rec[omen]d the above letter from him.'[63] In much the same way, the son of a sufferer, William Wake, concluded the account of his father by averring that it was 'a true and just account to my knowledge and perfect remembrance.'[64] Thomas Cox finished his note with the declaration that 'this I in part know, and have heard, and believe the whole to be true.'[65] Similarly, Mr Ford assured Walker that the information contained in his letter was 'what I have heard and I believe you may depend upon the truth of what I have written.'[66]

---

[60] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 213.

[61] By way of contrast, Maria João Violante Branco has pointed out that medieval Inquisitors adjudicating a dispute over ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Spain were primarily concerned to establish the veracity of the witness and secondly the truthfulness of his or her testimony; 'Memory and truth: the strange case of the witness enquiries of 1216 in the Braga-Toledo dispute' *Historical Research* 79 (February 2006), 2.

[62] For the efforts of a late seventeenth-century Scottish geographer to warrant his own and his informants' geographical observations see Withers, 'Reporting, Mapping, Trusting,' 511-15.

[63] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f.297.

[64] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 143.

[65] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 262.

[66] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 329.

Walker's project had resulted in the transformation of memories about the troubled past, acquired personally, from the mouths of sufferers, or from the testimonies of those who had heard about those times, into written records.[67] It is possible to understand each letter as a kind of material testimony of oral testimonies, a paper and ink witness to witnessing about the past.[68] That this is a fair characterization is supported by the fact that these letters were about the true *martyrs*, that is, Christian 'witnesses' of the previous century.[69] The act of narrating the suffering of the faithful during the late times turned informants and letter-writers into historians; the Church's story was, after all, widely regarded as a series of personal testimonies handed down over time.[70] For this reason the chapter will turn to an exploration of the characteristic properties of these epistolary histories.

Narrating the past in letters

Walker's correspondents transformed disparate testimonies into relatively coherent stories about the struggles of the loyal clergy against evil for the sake of the truth. In many such narratives, which bear some similarity to what literary scholars call romantic plots, the sufferings of the faithful clergyman or his family were vindicated.[71] These accounts usually included a description of a clergyman's good character and virtues, his ejection for loyalty to King and Church by rebels, the mistreatment he and his family suffered at their hands, the deficiencies of the intruding minister, and finally, the ejected cleric's restoration to his own at King Charles II's return. Before being sequestered in 1644, Thomas Lant of Harnsey, Middlesex, was 'well known to be a person of a truly primitive Temper and blameless Deportment, who never spoke evil of any man, even those who persecuted him, and was ever ready to doe good to all men.'[72] The minister of St Clement's in Sandwich, Benjamin Harrison, suffered the indignity of being dragged from his pulpit by soldiers and spending time in a Parliamentary jail, 'but when he did get out of their hands, left the town and return'd not till 1660, when [he] was again possessed of the said living.'[73] After losing his living, Charles Churchill, his wife and four children were 'forced to beg or starve for the space of five years.' The intruding minister left 'uppon the Kings restauration' so that 'Mr Churchill was restored to his benefice and there lived and died in a good old age.'[74] The rector of Settrington in Yorkshire, Thomas Garter, had been ejected by 'soldiers in a rude and barbarous manner,' but later 'at the Restauration [was]…restored to his living.'[75] In these stories the suffering of clergy clearly followed the pattern of Jesus' crucifixion, demonstrating that they were truly martyrs for their faith. Furthermore, the parallelism of the King's return, the minister's restoration, and Christ's resurrection reemphasised the providential nature of the Restoration; in 1660 both crown and Church had been vindicated by God.[76]

---

[67] See Ruth Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), 110-38.

[68] Paul Ricoeur argued that modern historical research and writing 'starts from testimony, not from the archives.' Human beings, he said, have 'nothing better than testimony, in the final analysis, to assure [themselves] that something did happen in the past, which someone attests to having witnessed in person;' *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 147.

[69] As Hobbes noted in *Leviathan* (III. Xlii. 272): 'Nor is it the Death of the Witnesse, but the Testimony it self that makes the Martyr: for the word signifieth nothing else, but the man that beareth Witnesse.'

[70] On the notion that ecclesiastical history ultimately rested upon personal testimonies see John Spurr, '"A Special kindness for dead bishops": The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 313-35.

---

[71] According to Hayden White, romantic plots are heroic tales of an individual's self-discovery and overcoming of the world, entailing a struggle of good against evil, the triumph of good after a series of setbacks, and conclude with the protagonist living happily ever after; such stories are the prototype of all 'progress narratives;' *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 7-11.

[72] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 176.

[73] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 387.

[74] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 286.

[75] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 246.

Nonetheless, a number of correspondents related tragic tales of ministers whose trials were not justified on earth.[77] In such stories the cleric died before the return of the King in 1660, or survived until that glad day only to pass away soon after and so be deprived of any earthly reward. For example, the minister of Liston in Devon, Bernard Hernimans, 'was seized by the Parliamentary soldiers and coming prisoner to Plymouth…he dyed about the year 1646 having been before sequestered and plundered.'[78] At Wresle in Yorkshire, Mr Tate, 'who had wife and several children…after many unchristian usages were absolutely all thrown out, he died soon after his ejectment.'[79] The heavy toll of sequestration on sufferers' mental well-being was plain in John Cole's account of Abraham Spenser, who survived 'by the Providence of God to see a turn of the times by the Kings Restoration, but thourough [sic] of great age and many infirmittys grown so childish as not to understand it and incapable of reaping the benefit to a restoration to his own Right.'[80]

While not explicitly invoking the war on earth between the representatives of Christ and Satan characteristic of apocalyptic theology, many letter writers certainly regarded Parliament's rebellion and persecution of the clergy as the most recent instalments in the age-old struggle outlined in Scripture between the servants of darkness and the children of light.[81] The term used by many of Walker's correspondents to characterize the period about which they wrote was 'rebellion,' to which various modifiers such as 'late great and wicked,' 'late and most horrid,' 'late and ungodly times of,' 'Rump,' and 'of 1641' could be added.[82] For John Northleigh the mid seventeenth century was marked by 'blood and rapine sacriledge and desolation.'[83] While it is possible that some of these characterizations of the 1640s and 1650s were drawn from the order of service used on Fast Days to commemorate the death of Charles I, their widespread use by correspondents suggests also that they understood the sufferings of the clergy during those years to be evidence of Antichrist's assault on the true Church of England, and as such part of a grander narrative of struggle between the true and false churches.[84]

---

[76] N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 32.
[77] Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 17.
[78] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 323.
[79] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 330-31.
[80] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 329.

A few letter-writers were also conscientious about situating the sufferings of their subjects within the bigger, if more mundane, story of the nation's turmoils. Samuel Hill was able to attach one sufferer's imprisonments with Interregnum royalist revolts, 'once upon occasion of Penruddock's and the other Boothes rising.' Nathaniel Mason noted that his father was presented to his rectory in 1644, sequestered in August 1646 'pursuant to their Parliamentary ordinance in Aug. 23 1645 by which it is ordained that any person using common Prayer in any private family shall for the first offence pay the summ of £5, for the 2nd £10, and for the 3rd suffer one whole years imprisonment without baele or mainprize.'[85] The Lord Protector's name was linked with events in several letters. Richard Nesling reported that one of his informants said he knew that 'Mr Brewster [was] turned out of Lawshal living in Suffolk in Olivers time;' the rector of Beaworthy in Devon, Henry Karslake, stated that his predecessor was in danger from the Committee 'in Cromwell's time of Tyranny.'[86] Nonetheless, most correspondents were satisfied simply to connect the chronology of the cleric's suffering with the outbreak of the troubles in 1641 and their conclusion in 1660. The civil wars and Interregnum were not narrated with gradual changes leading from one development to the next, but instead as a breach in time, indeed, as a uniquely transgressive moment, when the true faith and truly faithful bore the full force of evil's attack. [87]

---

[81] The importance of apocalyptic thinking to English Protestant theology prior to the civil wars is well covered by the works of Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1550-1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), and Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); for the continuing significance of this mode of thinking after 1660 we are indebted to the work of Warren Johnston; see his 'The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 467-501, and 'Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-89' in *The Historical Journal* 48 (2005), 351-389.
[82] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 153; c. 2, f. 340; c. 1, f. 211; c. 1, f. 205;; c. 1, f. 228.
[83] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 356. Walker employed the phrases 'late times of Rebellion and Confusion' in the 1704 version of his *Queries* to clergy, and 'late times of the grand Rebellion' the following year; Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 316 and c. 2, f. 325.
[84] Church of England, *A Form of Common Prayer to be used upon the thirtieth of January*... (London: John Bill, 1661). I was reminded of this point by Stephen Taylor.

The correspondents' belief in the wickedness of the troubled times was reinforced by the labels they used to describe the enemies of the faith. For example, a number of letter-writers used the adverbial form of 'barbarous' to describe the loyal clergy's treatment by Parliamentary soldiers or officials.[88] Similarly, the rector of Thorpe and Westwich in Norwich was subjected to 'all the opprobrious and base language' which could be used by 'rude and barbarous officers,' and William Wake could hardly believe that 'so barbarous and inhuman' practices as the kind suffered by his father during the rebellion 'could ever be committed by Englishmen in their own Country.[89] Many correspondents identified the persecutors with religious labels.[90] William Leman wrote about the oppressions of the ironically named 'Saints,' while J. Petre pointed out the clear gap between self-declared righteousness and wicked conduct among those men 'that called themselves the godlie paritie.'[91] Andrew Needham argued that the sequestrations of loyal clergy were irrefutable evidence of the 'Tyranny of Presbiterian, Independent, or Phanatick.' A number of letter writers did not distinguish between the different strands of the godly who were active during the 1640s and 1650s, preferring to lump them all together under the descriptor 'Fanatique' or 'Phanatick.'[92] The anger and bitterness of Richard Towgood was clear when he termed his father's persecutors as 'those cursed first born brats of Hell' who had somehow managed to 'to pass for pure sanctity and true holiness.'[93]

---

[85] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 191and f. 220.
[86] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 299, f. 230; c. 2, f. 243. Richard Paulett described the period as 'those dismall days of Misrule under Oliver Cromwell,' c. 1, f. 307.
[87] Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 34.
[88] For example, John Laurence's use of the phrase 'barbarously dragg'd;' Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 263.
[89] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 185; c. 1, f. 143.

These characterizations of the persecutors in the correspondents' stories were consistent with an interpretation of the civil wars as a struggle between the forces of good and evil. Significantly, the evil-doers in many of these accounts were clearly linked to Nonconforming Protestants, particularly Presbyterians and Independents. These stories implied that, far from being passive victims of an unjustly intolerant religious settlement after the Restoration, the ministers 'silenced' on Bartholomew Day 1662 had been integral to the persecution of the nation's true Protestant church. It was only thanks to the miracle of the King's return in 1660 that their campaign against the faithful was ultimately thwarted. Furthermore, these labels suggested the continuity between mid seventeenth-century puritans and early eighteenth-century Dissenters.[94] The gap in time from 1660 to 1704-05 had not changed the character of Dissent for Walker's correspondents; the essence of puritanism and its Nonconforming progeny was not in fact to have been unjustly persecuted but rather to be persecutors.[95] The most important implication of these labels was to reinforce the notion that the suffering of the clergy during the wars had been for the sake of their faith. They were persecuted for their loyalty to the confession of the reformed Church of England, genuine martyrs for the gospel truth. In other words, these letters were epistolary martyrologies whose narratives, once published, would remind the public that the established Church was descended from the holy and apostolic martyrs, and was therefore a true Church of Christ.

---

[90] A very few used political terms such as the 'Parliament Soldiers' or a 'Parlamical Lecturer,' Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 181; c.1, f. 186.
[91] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 232; c.1, f. 272.
[92] The persecutors were 'a Fanatique Crew' to Richard Paulett of Suffolk; Alex Mason noted that one of the intruding ministers in his Devonshire parish was 'one Mr Berrie a notorious Phanatick.' Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 307; c. 2, f. 350.
[93] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 133.

Memorializing the martyrs

The following section concerns the language Walker's correspondents used in their accounts to show that the mid seventeenth century was the latest persecution experienced by Christ's faithful servants, and that the Church by law established was indeed a true church. Proving that the suffering clergy were genuine Christian martyrs not only undermined the martyrological agenda of Nonconforming minister Edmond Calamy's *Abridgement*, but also legitimated contemporary political efforts to restrain the public profile of Protestant Dissenters in the nation's religious life. Furthermore, reminding the public of Anglican martyrs from the troubled times, as Walker's history would do, would support the Church's claim to be the true expression of English Christianity, despite the government's decision, embodied in the Toleration Act, not to penalise Protestant Nonconformists for refusing to worship in the form prescribed by the Act of Uniformity.

---

[94] On names as ascriptions that assign an agent to an action see Paul Ricoeur, 'Narrative Identity' in *Philosophy Today* 35 (1991), 74-5.

[95] On the importance of 'gaplessness' in the creation of historical continuity and descent, see Zerubavel, *Time Maps,* 61.

Correspondents who characterized the ejected clergy as martyrs almost invariably deployed what can be called the rhetoric of decency and fidelity, in which the sufferers' admirable qualities and virtues were accented to prove that they were persecuted solely for their beliefs, and to make their persecutors appear all the more reprehensible and wicked. The character of the sufferer was often encapsulated in phrases such as 'a loyal and learned,' 'pious and exemplary,' 'very generous and good natured,' and 'of a good life and conversation.'[96] The sufferings of Mr Henry Wilson, for example, prompted Edward Bradford to reflect that his predecessor was serious, sober, and orthodox, as exemplified by his devout and reverent reading of the Church's prayers and homilies.[97] The vicar of Cranford in Suffolk was remembered as a good man and decent preacher 'but above all for his liberal charity to the poor.'[98] A number of Walker's correspondents emphasised the sufferer's homiletic abilities: according to John Ellis, the rector of Earle Stoman had been 'a very honest man and a diligent preacher.' It was no doubt with a measure of pride that Anthony Gregory reported that the two sermons his grandfather delivered each Sunday were so popular that people from the surrounding parishes, including 'some of the greatest zealots' travelled up to fifteen miles to hear him.[99] These accounts of preaching re-emphasised the point that such clergy had been attacked unjustly; a pluralist could hardly have been a conscientious preacher.[100] Furthermore, reminders about good preachers within the Church might have been intended to refute the notion that preaching had been downplayed, or even suppressed, under Archbishop Laud during the 1630s.[101]

---

[96] Robert Hanbury's description of Mr Simson Paige of Huntingdonshire: Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 177; Joseph Wood on Mr Joseph Stock of Yorkshire: c. 1, f. 216; an anonymous author on Dr Whittington of Warwickshire: c. 1, f. 283; Ezra Pierce on Mr Henry Owen of Somerset: c. 1, f. 295; John Paine on Dr Robert Warren of Suffolk, c. 1, f. 309; Richard Paulett on Dr John Crofts of Suffolk: c. 1, f. 307.
[97] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 296.
[98] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 397.
[99] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 292.

Letter writers often inserted anecdotes into their description of the virtuous cleric to illustrate his good character. [102] For example, Tim Shute wrote about his grandfather being turned out for refusing to take Parliament's Solemn League and Covenant. It transpired, he declared, with 'this memorable passage:' that his grandfather, 'being inform'd what they said, presently reply'd, Gentlemen, the light of that Gospel which I preached to 'em, and you the rebellious sons of those-fathers will extinguish that light, then turning his back toward 'em and rubbing his feet in the floor said, I shake off the dust of my feet as a witness against you.'[103] Here the minister's action recalled the ritual of judgment which Jesus told his disciples to perform upon leaving towns which refused to hear them preach.[104] The anecdote characterized the elder Shute as a faithful witness to the truth who, while condemned by the Committee, proceeded to pronounce the true judgement of heaven on the ungodly. Benjamin Spurway wrote about a post-Restoration encounter between the magnanimous Dr Gandy and his former antagonist Major Worth, then in prison.[105] The Major saw the Doctor and recognized that his life was in the cleric's hands, yet Dr Gandy simply asked for a bottle of wine which 'he courteously drank to him and sayd, I have satisfaction.'[106] One anonymous correspondent proved the righteousness of a minister from Surrey with an anecdote of reversal, characteristic of biblical parables.[107] In the letter the writer described how Mr Fisher came to turn out Dr Turner from the rectory of Fetcham; however, 'Mrs Turner was big with child and looked almost any time to fall into Travayle,' so naturally the incumbent asked if they might tarry until she had delivered the child and was fit to travel. But Turner refused to show mercy and forced the couple away. According to the letter-writer

---

[100] I owe this point to Lesley Cormack.
[101] The increasing tendencies toward sacramentalism under Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud (1633-1646) is outlined in Peter Lake's 'The Laudian style: order, uniformity and the pursuit of the beauty of holiness in the 1630s' in Kenneth Fincham (ed.) *The early Stuart church, 1603-1642*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993), 161-183, but c.f. Anthony Milton, 'The creation of Laudianism : a new approach' in Thomas Cogswell, Richard P. Cust and Peter Lake (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain : Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 162-84.
[102] Following Annabel Patterson, anecdotes were short stories about human action, able to be detached from the larger plot, and concerning one or more remarkable individuals; see Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 42-7.
[103] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 236.
[104] Luke 9:5.

> At the happy restauration when the Dr came to take possession of his living and house again, it happened that Fisher's wife was in the same condition….To whom the Dr made this reply: Mr Fisher do you remember what you denied to my wife, how now can you …desire, as expect that I should now grant it to you? However though you showed little of Christianity, you shall see that I am (I Thank god) a Christian, let her in gods name stay so long in the house and welcome.[108]

The unexpected demonstration of kindness shown by Turner to the intruder's wife—in effect an act of forgiveness—identified him as the true Christian.[109]

The goodness of conforming clergy was indirectly portrayed in a number of letters by stories that ridiculed or unmasked the charges brought by the clergy's persecutors. The disaffected members of Richard Ven's flock were so foolish as to link all set prayer in worship with popery, alleging that 'he read masse in his house, such you know the common prayer was counted in those days.'[110] One correspondent wrote that his informant had recalled asking a man named Peter Waller why he and his group had apprehended the parish clerk; Waller had simply replied that 'twas for singing malignant psalms.' Unusually, and certainly memorably, Thomas Renett claimed that the subject of his account, Mr E. Lewes of Suffolk, was accused of wizardry.[111] Although Thomas Archbold of Havington in Worcester was a staunch defender of the king and the bishops, an anonymous letter writer reported that the real 'occasion of the complaint' against him was in fact 'a design formed by some of his Parishioners to enclose part of the common fields which he did oppose.'[112] Another anonymous correspondent graphically emphasised his or her outrage at 'chief Article' alleged against Lionel Playters, the rector of Uggeshall in Suffolk; it was 'that he did use to eat custard after a Scandalous manner and **for this** he was put out of his living.'[113] These accounts (literally) underscored the hypocrisy of the persecutors, and showed that their 'godliness' was only a cloak for ambition and self-interest.

---

[105] The importance of Christian magnanimity for identifying a true hero seems to have declined in mainstream literature after the Restoration, while remaining potent in Nonconformist writings such as Milton's *Samson Agonistes*; see John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age,'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 84-101.

[106] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 284.

[107] See Robert W. Funk, *Parables and Presence: Forms of the New Testament Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), *passim*. Reversal in parables occurs when the anticipated recipient of judgment becomes the recipient of unexpected grace, e.g. the prodigal son of Luke 15.

[108] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 37.

[109] It may also be a jab at the strict *solafideism* of some puritans.

According to the correspondents, the clergy who suffered during the troubles were martyrs for the Christian faith reposed within the established Episcopal Church and defended by its temporal governor, the king.[114] The rector of Great and Little Leak, Nottinghamshire, Edward Bigland, had endured sequestration and imprisonment 'only for his loyalty to the King, and firm adherence to the Church.'[115] In 1642 Dr Marks was 'surprised and imprisoned for his loyalty;' similarly Abraham Spenser of St Michael's in Herefordshire was turned out of his vicarage 'for the vertues' of loyalty to the king and constancy to the Church of England.[116] Notable proof for a number of letter-writers of a clergyman's fidelity to the Church was refusing to swear adherence to Parliament's Solemn League and Covenant, which had pledged the extirpation of 'Church government by archbishops, bishops...and all other ecclesiastical offices depending on that hierarchy.'[117] The 'strictest inquiry' undertaken by Charles Harward into the experience of John Pynsent revealed that he was 'turn'd out by authority of Parliament for not taking the Covenant.'[118] The father of Thomas Tylott of Suffolk was labelled a malignant and endured ejection and a spell in prison during 1643 for his refusal.[119] According to John Gaskarth of London, Dr Edward Layfield had 'cheerfully' resigned all his spiritual livings rather than take 'the Covenant the Shibboleth of the times.'[120] The Solemn League and Covenant was a symbol for these correspondents of the Long Parliament's attack on the ancient and apostolic office of bishops, the truth and authority of which the faithful clergy upheld through their sufferings. Suffering for refusing to swear to it was sure proof that the clergy were martyrs for their faith.

---

[110] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 2, f. 333.

[111] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 298. Renett went on to say that 'concerning Mr E. Lewes my father was always of the opinion that Mr Lewes suffered wrongfully, and have often said that he did believe he was no more a Wizard than he was.'

[112] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 184.

[113] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 271; underscoring and bold in the original.

[114] That the Church's relationship with the Restoration monarchy was often quite complicated, leaving many clergy feeling threatened, is brought out in John Spurr 'Religion in Restoration England' in Lionel K. Glassey (ed.) *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), 90-124. Jacqueline Rose has pointed out that the meaning and implications of the doctrine of the royal supremacy for the Church were debated within Reformation-era frameworks well into the later Stuart period; 'Royal ecclesiastical supremacy and the Restoration church' *Historical Research* 80 (2007), 324-45.

Numerous letter-writers included stories about the particular sufferings their spiritual ancestors underwent for the sake of fidelity to the Church, including physical abuse and humiliation. According to N. Gwynn, soldiers belonging to Colonel Massey's regiment had burst in upon John Feneber while the minister was administering the sacrament of baptism. Gwynn claimed that Feneber was stripped 'of all his clothes, but a pair of drawers,' and then led through the cold and wet weather.[121] Michael Dolling suffered for months from the 'barbarous and disgraceful treatment' he received from Parliamentary soldiers, who had forced the cleric to ride with them to prison 'on a bare bon'd lean hard trotting horse of theirs without saddle.'[122] A Dorset clergyman who disputed the authority of its Parliamentary committee to fortify Wareham was pistol-whipped, shot and cut in the head, and left with '11 cuts and wounds from the swords and bullets.'[123] A number of letters also contained accounts of clergy being imprisoned. William Wake asserted that his father was gaoled nineteen times; during one particularly odious confinement at Dorchester the senior Wake and three other men 'threw out a slimy scabb all over their boddyes, which was supposed saved their lives.'[124] Giles Satterly learned from his father and another sufferer about the particularly awful conditions in Exeter prison, surrounded by human filth and forbidden, unlike the apostles Paul and Silas, to sing Psalms: not even the pagan Romans were as cruel as the Puritans.[125] Upon Edward Layfield's conviction of malignancy, he spent time 'confined in most jayles about London,' eventually languishing below decks of a ship and having to pay his keepers for the benefit of fresh air.[126] Like the apostles of the New Testament, these were Christians forced to endure the most wretched and base confinements on account of their faith.

---

[115] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 88.
[116] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 388; c. 1, f. 329.
[117] 'A solemn league and covenant for reformation and defence of religion' in J. P. Kenyon (ed.), *The Stuart Contitution, 1603-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 264. The importance of the Covenant for radicalizing Parliamentary politics during the 1640s is part of Edward Vallance's argument in *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005).
[118] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 335.
[119] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f. 303.
[120] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c. 1, f 395. The presbyterian implications of the Covenant for the government of the church were the grounds of Mr Travis's refusal: c. 1, f. 324.

---

[121] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 123. Similarly, the horse troop sent by General Sir Thomas Fairfax in the depths of December to collect Richard Ven for questioning was 'so severe in executing their orders that they took him as they found him, not permitting him to put on warmer clothes, and carried him away with them in a wet and cold day, it being two days before Christmas; c.2, f. 333.
[122] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 367.
[123] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 143.
[124] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 143.
[125] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 245.
[126] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 395.

Walker's correspondents also wrote about faithful clergy reduced to severe poverty and hardship by Parliamentarian plundering or sequestration of their living. For example, Elias Carter told Walker that his predecessor had 'his house several times plundered insomuch as lost all he had.'[127] According to John Burrough, Parliamentary troopers plundered the goods of James Burnard, and then sold them before his face; meanwhile his books were thrown around the house and badly damaged.[128] After officials from the Commonwealth regime seized the profits from Samuel Ware's two livings he 'became very poor' and maintained his family with only the 'small contributions' from sympathetic neighbours.[129] The rector of Chilcombe in Worcester related what a Farmer Croswell had told the rector of Chilcombe that his ejected predecessor, John Hagar, had moved to London to seek employment, but was reduced to such straights that upon seeing 'a peece of bread, or cheese, in the ground, He dropt his glove upon it, ^took it up^ and eat it with a good appetite.'[130]

A few correspondents related stories of ministers who made the ultimate witness to the gospel by yielding up their lives. In a very short epistle, J. Whiteford of Norfolk wrote 'a remarkable story' about a minister who was tried Christmas day and then hung 'before his own door.'[131] One of the king's chaplains at Oxford, Dr Edward Mansell, had died while imprisoned in nearby Abingdon; similarly, Edward Bigland perished from a cold he caught while en route to a London gaol.'[132] The rector of Chedroy in Somerset died after he was run through with a sword during a tussle with the gaoler of Wells over a letter to the minister's wife.[133] According to Thomas Rowell his predecessor, Dr Franklin, lost his life while trying to escape from a safe house beset by soldiers. Franklin attempted to vault himself 'over the Garden poles on the backside of the House, [but] hung himself upon a pole which ran into his groin, of which he soon after died.'[134] It is possible that Rowell related these particularly graphic details of Franklin's death because he believed they were remarkable and therefore memorable.[135] Within martyrological writings, however, the nature of the suffering was less important than the fact that it occurred because of the individual's adherence to the true faith.

---

[127] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 221.
[128] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 311. Several other letter writers noted the theft of books, such as John Tindall, who related that 'the Plymouth Soldiers' took from the Henry Smith's 'all their goods and his books;' c. 2, f. 278. When Samuel Seaward's house was plundered 'his study of Books, which was very valuable, and all his manuscripts were violently taken from him, and never restored, which the good man often and deeply lamented, as a thing that went near him.;' c.1, f. 172.
[129] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 223.
[130] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 211.
[131] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 29.

Martyrologists, such as John Foxe, often highlighted the cruelty of persecutors, especially towards women.[136] This theme was also evident in the early letters to Walker. For example, J. Gilbert was 'credibly informed' that when the intruder took possession of the rectory 'by violence with some troopers' his predecessor's wife 'holding by the staple of the door, the flesh of her hands was torn off to pull her out.'[137] Even more chilling was the account of the conduct of a man who took over from the rightful incumbent

---

[132] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 23; and c.1, f. 88. This particular event was also related by John Orten of Rearsby: ''Mr Bigland Rector of great and little Leath in Nottinghamshire, my wife's grandfather, was sequestered, and taken prisoner towards Nottingham, and forced to lie in a wagon in the field all night where he got the palsie, that was the cause of his death;' c. 1, f. 64.
[133] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 3.
[134] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 225.
[135] The connection between concrete details in stories and their enhanced 'reality effect' is suggested by Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-century France*, (Oxford: Polity Press, 1987), 44.
[136] On Foxe's treatment of women in particular see Ellen Macek, 'The Emergence of a Feminine Spirituality in the *Book of Martyrs*,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19 (1988), 62-80; Thomas Freeman, '"The Good Ministrye of Godlye and Vertuous Women:" The Elizabethan martyrologists and the female supporters of the Marian martyrs,' *Journal of British Studies* 39 (2000), 8-33; Megan L. Hickerson, *Making Women Martyrs in Tudor England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
[137] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 15v.

Richard Castle in Hereford. When the incumbent's wife resisted her family's ejection from their home by clinging tightly to a bedpost, Woodward ordered a group of soldiers to remove her by force, which they refused to do. Then Woodward, 'more cruel and merciless then they,' went to her and 'having a new pair of shoes on kickt her upon the belly with that violence, that it gave her a rupture.' Within a year the woman was dead, most people attributing her demise to Woodward's cruelty.[138] Letters written by women or dependent on female informants tended to emphasise the suffering that ejected ministers' wives endured during pregnancy or soon after parturition.[139] Frances King recalled that in the act of searching her mother's pockets for clandestine correspondence, a Parliamentary sequestrator had 'soe frightened my mother, that itt caused a miscarriage of a child, and much indangered her life.'[140] An anonymous correspondent from Warwickshire related how a group of soldiers seeking quarter entered the parsonage of one Dr Temple, and proceeded into 'Mrs Temple's Chamber, who having lately miscarry'd they pull'd the bed cloths of her in that condition, they carry'd her forth (being just recovered out of a swoone) in a chair.'[141] As in the accounts of slain clerics, the stories of their abused wives demonstrated their continuity with earlier Christian female martyrs, and pointed out the wickedness of Nonconformists' spiritual ancestors.

---

[138] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 326.

[139] This element of female correspondence is discussed in greater depth by Ann Lawrence in 'This Sad and Deplorable Condition,' 465-88.

[140] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 28. King also noted that Wright was 'a collar by trade (who often worked in my fathers hall, mending horse geeres and glad of a pott of strong beare).'

[141] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 283. J. Gilbert also related this incident, albeit with some greater contextual detail. Gilbert had heard stories of Temple's suffering, particularly one concerning 'his Wife one of a Good Family,' who soon after giving birth during the winter was taken out of her bed one night 'and cast upon the ground, by which she lost the use of one foot to her dying day;' Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 15. These two versions have similarities and divergences characteristic of oral traditions, suggesting that the treatment of Temple's wife had become part of the shared memories of the civil wars among Anglican clerics in Warwickshire.

Although most accounts of female suffering portrayed wives and daughters as innocent and helpless victims of Parliamentary tyranny, at least one recounted an instance of rhetorical resistance. An anonymous letter writer from Rutland included a fascinating anecdote concerning one clergyman's wife who had engaged in a verbal sparring match with plundering soldiers. The third time the rector of Glaston's goods were seized by sequestrators, they had

> entered into their Inventory the pot hanging over the fire, upon which the good Gentlewoman asked them whether they intended to enter the beef and the pudding boyling in it for the childrens dinner. They sayd no, for they intended to eat that when their business was over. Then she sayd Pray Gentlemen be pleas'd to enter my Children amongst the rest of the goods. No sayd they, we intend to leave them to you in lieu of your fifths.[142]

In this account the woman's offer of assistance unmasked the depths of her persecutors' cruelty and barbarity, particularly toward the weakest members of the household, her children. Although she was suffering only for her husband's loyalty and fidelity to King and Church, and was powerless before the enemies of government and religion, she was able to match wits with and speak the truth to her mighty oppressors.[143] This is not to imply that female agency ought to be seen only in stories of resistance.[144] That many correspondents wanted to commemorate the importance of women's work to maintain their families, and the power to which such efforts bore witness, was evident from their stories of the tremendous efforts clergymen's wives made to support their families after losing their homes and livings.[145] To narrate and thus to encourage the remembrance of enduring terrible hardships for the sake of their faith was sufficient proof of female agency, for while Parliament and its allies had overthrown (temporarily) the government of the King and his Church, they had not overcome God's truth or his truly faithful handmaidens.

---

[142] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 264. The 'fifths' were twenty per cent of the annual value of the benefice which Parliament ordered should be paid to the ejected incumbent's family by his replacement.

[143] The ability of godly women, empowered by the Holy Spirit, to confute their popish persecutors is another prominent theme in Foxe; see, for example, his account of Anne Askew in the 1570 edition of *Acts and Monuments*, (STC 11223), 1413-20.

[144] This is one argument within a particular strand of early modern women's historiography, for example, Ulrinka Rublack, *The Crimes of Women in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

A number of letter writers wrote stories of the Parliament's desecration of Church fabric. One of Alex Mason's informants, Roger Harris, affirmed that he saw soldiers under the command of the Earl of Essex scratching out an engraving of the Ten Commandments while saying 'It is Popery down with them etc.'[146] John Reeve concluded his letter testifying that as a child he witnessed soldiers plundering Norwich Cathedral: they had brought the pulpit, communion table-cloth, surplice, prayer books, and all ornaments 'in triumph' to the market place near the Guildhall, where these instruments of divine service were burnt.[147] Nathaniel Mason claimed that in September 1644 Cornet Sewal removed the surplice and prayer books out of Ashwell church, tied them to his horse's tail, and then dragged them 'in derision and triumph' through the town.'[148] The old sexton of Stonham, Suffolk told Thomas Reeve 'that the Rebells at that time made great havock in this Church,' defacing monuments, pulling down finely carved angels, and smashing stained glass 'as cost at once repairing above 20 pounds.'[149] Stories of iconoclasm such as these, when added to the stories of pain and misery inflicted upon loyal ministers and their families during the troubles, re-emphasised the truth that the Church's tribulations under the puritan regime were indeed apocalyptic, in other words, simply the latest instalment in the centuries-old struggle between Christ and Antichrist, the true Church versus the false church.[150]

---

[145] Laurence, 'Sad and Deplorable Condition;' Shelley Woolf's forthcoming work on gender in the Walker papers will no doubt elucidate these issues further.
[146] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 350.
[147] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 78.
[148] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 220.
[149] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 85.

The notion that the civil wars witnessed a struggle between true and false church was also brought out in letters with stories of providential punishments, which was a widespread *topos* of Christian martyrological writing going back to Lactantius.[151] The most memorable aspect of Benjamin Harrison's ejection from his living during divine service was that on the afternoon of the very day when soldiers had pulled him from the pulpit an accident involving gunpowder at the barracks killed 'the man that first laid his hands upon him.'[152] Three members of one parish who had betrayed their minister subsequently suffered judgment: one 'dyed miserably, the one by a fall from his horse, a 2nd was drowned and the 3rd dyed ravingly distracted.'[153] Two stories of divine judgment, one involving a disloyal parishioner and the other an intruder, demonstrated the providentialist notion of the powerful connection between speech and effect.[154] A man from Wittesham, Kent, whose false testimony against Rector Tourney landed the cleric in prison, thereafter had boasted that Tourney 'shall never come out again so long as my Eyes are open.' The proud man was later caught in quicksand while hunting ducks along the seashore and drowned by the rising tide. According to the narrator the body was discovered 'on that day, as I think, or within a few daies' after Tourney was restored to his family.[155] John Ellis of Suffolk related a particularly striking anecdote of God's overt disapproval of a certain intruder. The replacement minister, one Mr Clark, prayed to the Lord in the presence of his supporters the Saturday evening prior to his first service that if his coming to the church was illegitimate in God's eyes that some sign would be given. Clark offered up the same prayer Sunday morning before his sermon, 'which done, he no sooner read the text, but he was stricken dumb and was not able to speak to the people.' After thirty minutes of vain attempts to speak, Clark began to leave the pulpit, and 'he no sooner lay'd his hand upon the pulpit door' than his voice returned. Confronted by this clear token of God's disapproval, Clark told the congregation to take back the ejected clergyman.[156] Remembering God's judgements in these stories reinforced the correspondents' contention that the suffering clergy were true martyrs, that the established Church was the true church, and that their oppressors and their descendants were agents of Anti-Christ.[157]

---

[150] Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, 32-110; Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*, 13-46; and Johnston 'The Anglican Apocalypse,' 467-501.

[151] The importance of providential thinking throughout English religious culture in eighty years after the Elizabethan reformation is outlined in Alexandra Walsham's *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), esp. 65-115. I owe the reference to Lactantius to Dr. Woolf. For Foxe's accounts of divine retribution on Catholic persecutors see Patrick Collinson, 'Truth and legend,' 31-54, and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Fate, faction, and fiction,' 601-24.

[152] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 387.

[153] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c 2, f. 337.

[154] For earlier examples from providentialist literature of a person's wish coming alarmingly true see Walsham, *Providence*, 82-85.

---

[155] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 200.

[156] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 340. Ellis continues: 'The above relation is a true copie of what I transcribed a good many years since from a loose paper in which were divers other short account of some things that happened in those times ^of confusion^ all written (as I have good reason to believe) in Bishop Joseph Hall's own hand.'

[157] For a similar desire among Restoration dissenters to remember God's past deeds, which they hoped would stir him to recall and help his people, see Sharon Achinstein's *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 66-79. The importance of providentialism for understanding the motivations of the godly during the civil wars and Interregnum is analyzed by Blair Worden in 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England' in *Past and Present* 109 (1985), 55-99, and John Morrill and Philip Baker, 'Oliver Cromwell, the regicide and the sons of Zeruiah' in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 14-35.

Recalling the persecutors

Narrating the clergy's cruel treatment during the civil wars at the hands of early eighteenth-century Dissenters' ancestors, the puritans' spiritual and civil usurpations of legitimately ordained and installed ministers, and the general religious anarchy of the troubled times reinforced the Church's position that non-resistance to authority and obedience to the hierarchy were public signs of Christian holiness.[158] A number of letters recounted the violence and disorder fostered by the godly during the wars. For example, Philip Phelips told how Mikepher Alphery was once confronted one Sunday by 'a file of Musketers' while he was preaching. The soldiers 'came and pulled him out of his pulpit, turn'd him out of the church, and went to the parsonage house and threw out his wife and children with his goods.'[159] A few elderly parishioners remembered that their rector, Robert Ward, 'was forced from his charge on the Lords Day in time of divine service' by a group of horse troopers.'[160] Notable for its realistic attention to details such as time and names, and for its carnavalesque elements, was the account underwritten by Francis Cryset of Melford, Sussex, aged 73 years. Cryset testified that around St Bartholomew's Day 1641 he witnessed a group of 'Presbyterians' plunder the minister's five horses and many household goods. In addition to stealing, the Presbyterians disgraced the incumbent by barging in on him during worship, calling him a 'false prophet,' forcibly removing him from the pulpit, and dragging him back to his house while 'one of the said party beat a frying pan before him in derision, saying This is your saints bell.'[161] These stories which recalled the saints' insouciant and sacrilegious disruptions of holy offices were clearly intended to give the lie to their self-designation, and to show the public when Walker's history would be published that they were the real persecutors of true religion.

---

[158] Keeble, *England in the 1660s*, 109-125.
[159] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 161.
[160] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 265.
[161] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 309.

Numerous correspondents recounted the notorious character, beliefs, and deeds of the ejected clergy's replacements, also known as intruders. After the death of the episcopally ordained cleric in 1655 the congregation at Virginstow in Devon had to make do with prayers read by an ale-house keeper.[162] The letter-writer from Yelvertoft, Northampton noted that the four men successively put in by Parliament were illiterate except the last one, a Mr Symkins, who used his ability to compose a 'flattering piece dedicated to O[liver] C[romwell].'[163] Into the place of Thomas Haywood at Radeby in Huntingdonshire was put a man remembered by the ancient people of the parish as having 'always a huge pitcher of ale by in the chimney corner,' and for leaving divine service to answer nature's call 'when the psalm was a singing.'[164] There was nothing memorable about Peter Saxton from Leeds, save for his 'Ignorance, scurrility, and stirring the people up to Rebellion.'[165]

These examples of poorly qualified and uncouth men bolstered the Church's argument that episcopal ordination and oversight were necessary to maintain a truly godly ministry across the land. Furthermore, these anecdotes highlight the importance of the principle of legitimacy, that is, historically justified and observable relationships, for both the correspondents and the protagonists of their letters.[166] Since the Reformation the Church and its faith had been part of the common-law fabric of the nation.[167] The Church's ministers were men who had been lawfully ordained, and legitimately come into their livings, understood to be forms of property.[168] The persecutors, by contrast, and the men who intruded into the clergy's livings, were agents of usurped and therefore illegitimate authorities.[169] Therefore there had been no way of discerning whether the gospel these intruders proclaimed was from Christ or from the powers of this world.

---

[162] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 244.
[163] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 180; f. 263.
[164] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 255.
[165] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 181; f. 235.

The illegitimacy of intruding ministers was further exemplified through anecdotes which conveyed their ridiculous and dangerous doctrines. The people at Hitcham, Suffolk, reportedly remembered Myles Burkett offering up a prayer the Sunday following the execution of Charles I, in which he asked 'Almighty God if he had not smelt a sweet savour of blood.'[170] Similarly provocative was Walter Shute, declaring that same Sunday, 'Now I plainly see that Hell is pav'd with the skulls of King and Princes.'[171] When James Bevesham, minister at Cransford in Suffolk from 1650 until 1658, held forth in the pulpit, 'his auditors were very often forced into violent laughter.'[172] During a sermon in which the theatrical Mr Legate 'feared some would be disgusted' by one of his arguments, he declared that 'if this be not true I will cutt my Bible in pieces;' Legate then proceeded to pull out a knife, and began to hack and slash as though he meant what he said.'[173] A former Parliamentary army chaplain, Mr Thomas Larkham, was remembered 'by all' as 'a sower of discord and hatred,' who claimed that, like Christ himself, he had come 'not to bring peace but the sword.'[174]

---

[166] Michael J. Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 71.

[167] N. L. Jones, *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion 1559* (London: Swift, 1982); Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 117-131, 357-363. The connection between the common law and the Church, Walker's correspondents would have all agreed, had been reinforced by the Act of Uniformity in 1662; Spurr, 'Religion in Restoration England,' 97-104

[168] Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 236-245. The title of church livings, particularly vicarages and curates, however, tended to belong to lay or ecclesiastical patrons, such as local gentry, an archbishop, a corporation or university college.

[169] I owe these points to J. R. Jones.

[170] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 244.

[171] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 278.

[172] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 397.

Letters that included examples of the rampant religious irregularity that the godly permitted to flourish during the troubles emphasised the spiritual chaos which had engulfed the nation when there were no bishops and no king. Although Edward Bynes, an the Independent intruding minister, was remembered as personally upright, nevertheless the letter-writer claimed that 'the great neglect of the sacrament of the L[ord's] S[upper] in his time was very scandalous.'[175] The second intruder to serve at Brixham parish in Devon 'would whine and cry in the pulpit, and had all the canting and ridiculous postures of those times.'[176] Mr Scammel recounted that under the usurpers worship at this parish was performed 'as the fashion of *the world which then was, would have it.' Along the margin he explained: '*as the God of this world would have it,' implying that the forces of Anti-Christ had directed the liturgy.[177] Particularly lengthy and devastating in his critique of the state of religion during the Cromwellian Protectorate was Robert Browber. He denounced the 'mighty flood and terrible torrent' of heterodox theologies and schisms which the Protector permitted and which had captured and ruined the souls of thousands. While loyal and orthodox ministers were forbidden to administer the sacraments, to preach, and even work as chaplains or schoolmasters, up and down the land the emissaries of the papacy, historically linked with Antichrist, attacked the formerly established Protestant Church with impunity. Bowber raged against the

---

[173] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 307.
[174] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 294.
[175] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 316.
[176] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 301.
[177] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 261. The marginalia evokes 1 Corinthians 4:4, 'In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.'

> thousands of Romish emissaries, Jesuits, Franciscans, popish priests, friars of all sorts under visors of Independents, Anabaptists, Ranters, Quakers, free-willers, soldiers, artificers [who] had free liberty and protection to preach, teach, declare and baptize…and to meet together and to do what they list in publick and private meetings without the least check and control.[178]

This devastating assessment of Cromwell's popishly-inspired religious regime demonstrated Bowber's conviction, no doubt widely shared among Walker's correspondents that the spiritual and political chaos unleashed by Parliament's revolt and the rule of the so-called saints had very nearly blotted out the gospel in England. Only by a miracle had legitimate government in church and state been restored in 1660. Therefore, those ministers listed in the ninth chapter of Calamy's *Abridgement* who had lost their livings in 1662 by refusing to conform to the requirements of the Act of Uniformity had in a sense disobeyed not only the verdict of Parliament but of God himself. They truly were rebels, not martyrs.

Epistolary Vindications

The narratives of clerical suffering which made their way to John Walker in letters were like fragments of testimony and tradition the early Christian evangelists knit together to form the New Testament gospels; from many short stories would emerge a larger narrative about the witnesses to the true faith.[179] Taking the correspondence as a whole, it is possible to see emerging a metanarrative of oppression and divine deliverance. Like Israel in Egypt, during the 1640s and 1650s God's people had been enslaved by worshippers of false gods, yet thankfully, God showed mercy to the nation. At the happy Restoration of King Charles II the people and their true Church crossed into the promised land of freedom. No doubt many of Walker's correspondents hoped that a similar salvific moment was at hand with the accession of a Church of England queen, a Tory-dominated Parliament and ministry, and a vibrant and vigorous Convocation. At least one of Walker's correspondents however, reminded him that some clergymen had felt the slave-master's lash on account of their faith before 1640. In those days 'the violence of Bishop Laud and other bishops of that time was so great, that many ministers, who could not comply with all the impositions were forced to leave the land and become exiles.' He also declared that among the regular clergy during those years there had been 'many of them notoriously debauched (as they are now) and lamentably ignorant.'[180]

---

[178] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.2, f. 231v.

[179] For the process whereby oral traditions about Jesus' words and deeds were transmitted and eventually knit together towards the end of the first century C.E. into written gospels see, inter alia, E.P. Sanders, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989); J.C. O'Neill, 'Lost written

Most of Walker's correspondents were understandably unwilling to relate stories of Laudian excesses or fallen ministers that could be used not only to justify historically Parliament's campaigns against so-called malignant clergy, but could give fodder to contemporary critics of priestcraft. These early letters are therefore significant not only for their authors' attempts to witness to Anglican martyrs but also to ignore or to forget complicating or unsettling aspects about the troubled times, such as the moral failings of some pre-civil war clergymen, the episodic nature of sequestrations, the relative religious peace achieved by the Protectorate, the hostility between Presbyterians, Independents,

---

records of Jesus' words and deeds behind our records' *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991), 483-504; and John K. Riches, *Conflicting Mythologies:Iidentity Formation in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000).

[180] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 9.

and separatist sects, and, in some quarters, the persistence of Episcopal ordinations.[181] As in all accounts about the past, what was left out and forgotten can be as important as what in included; indeed, there can be no story, nor commemoration, without at least a measure of oblivion.[182] The letters were thus clearly an effort to stamp a particular meaning on the past for the future; to delimit the range of available narratives through which posterity would make sense of the wars, and of their implications for the present.[183]

For Robert Browber, as for most of Walker's early correspondents, civil wars and Interregnum had witnessed an attack, led by the spiritual and biological ancestors of contemporary Dissenters, on Christian faith reposed in the established Church's clergy.[184] The patient suffering endured by faithful clergy was, according to John Northleigh, 'a passiveness rather to be gloried in with the cross than ridiculed and reproached by some of those very Persecutors of late yet living and their numerous and flourishing offspring.'[185] The true martyrs of the seventeenth century had been men, and their families, who were often violently forced from their livings for fidelity to the legally established Christian Church by religious hypocrites. That Walker's correspondents clearly believed these dissembling men continued to pose a threat, albeit more insidiously, to the Church was suggested by references in the letters to the persecutors as

---

[181] Cross, 'The Church in England, 1646-1660,' 104ff.; Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 101-15,

[182] Friedrich Nietzsche, 'On the uses and disadvantages of history for life' in *Untimely Meditations*. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 62.

[183] An example of a late medieval effort to alter perceptions of the ninth century through archival deletions is outlined by Patrick Geary in *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

[184] The sense among Anglicans and Tories that Dissenters and, to a lesser extent, Whigs, were latter-day Roundheads see Hoppitt, *Land of Liberty*, 2; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 66-68. The importance of notions of descent for creating the sense of continuity is highlighted by Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 58-62.

[185] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 356.

Presbyterians and Independents.[186] Because Dissenters had not altered their principles since the troubles, and had not submitted to the legitimate authority of the Church's spiritual governors—the bishops—they still represented a danger to Christian faith. Further proof of this threat was supplied in the present by the practice of occasional conformity, which allowed Nonconformists to exercise public offices from which perhaps one day they might again attack the Church as had the Long Parliament.[187]

Perhaps of even greater concern to Walker's correspondents was the fact that many within the Church refused to acknowledge the threat posed by Dissenters to the faith; Northleigh, for example, railed against 'our low Churchmen and moderate statesmen' who soothed the sensibilities of contemporary Dissenters by calling the late troubles 'A civill war.' The present times demanded that the legitimate clergy stand as firm to the true faith against its enemies as had the faithful suffering clergy during the Dissenters' 'day of their wrath and of their power of Darkness.'[188] Therefore, the martyrologies conveyed within Walker's correspondence were not only intended to refute Calamy's vindication of Restoration Nonconformists by proving that the true martyrs of the previous century were Christians loyal to the established Church, but also to rouse lukewarm Anglicans at the beginning of Anne's reign to greater faithfulness towards, and stronger support for, the true faith for which so many had been persecuted and even died, including the queen's paternal grandfather.[189]

---

[186] See above pages 294-5.

[187] For analysis of the contested representations of Dissent in the early eighteenth century see Mark Knights, 'Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, Moderation and Zeal' in Stephen Taylor and David L. Wykes (eds.) *Parliament and Dissent* (Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 42-57.

[188] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 356.

[189] I thank J. R. Jones for reminding me of this point.

It is higly probable that the figure of King Charles the Martyr loomed largely in the minds of Walker's correspondents. The recent attacks in print on Charles I's character and judgment, and denials of his martyrdom, would not have been perceived by the letter-writers as simply political vindications of the Long or Rump Parliaments, or of Nonconformists, or the Revolution Settlement, or even of the current war against France, but fundamentally as attacks on the established Church as a true Church.[190] If Charles I had not died a martyr then the faith for which he shed his blood was false.[191] If the faith of the Church was untrue then its rights to command the attention of the nation in spiritual matters, to be the primary inculcator of public morality, and to dispense the sacraments necessary for salvation were in jeopardy.[192]

Letters which proved that the suffering clergy were genuine martyrs for the true faith vindicated the place of the Church in English public life; it, and not Nonconformist churches, was the authentic repository of true Christianity. The Church's position and power in the nation's life were not based upon deceit or priestcraft, but rather upon the truth of its proclamation, to which the loyal clergy, and Charles I, had witnessed not that long ago with their blood. The fact that the clergy who had suffered during the civil wars and Interregenum were genuine Christian martyrs meant that the Church of England and not Dissenting Protestants was the true Body of Christ in the post-Revolution polity.

---

[190] Justin Champion, 'Religion's safe, with priestcraft is the war': Augustan anti-clericalism and the legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 547-61.

[191] The truth of religion was at the core of the Church's defence of religious uniformity before 1689, and restricting the public profile of Dissenters after the Toleration Act; Mark Goldie, 'The Theory of Religion Intolerance in Restoration England' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 350-59; Spaeth, *Church in Danger*, 16-19; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 171-93.

[192] Andrew Starkie argues that divisions in the Church in the early eighteenth century were not just politically partisan but concerned its fundamental nature, that is, whether it was a repository of apostolic truth or a providentially and progressively changing institution; 'Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier,'*Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 335-43.

Therefore, debates about the true martyrs from the recent past were, like concerns about priestly power, about which faith community ought to define the nation's spiritual and moral centre.[193] Walker's correspondents believed the public ought to remember the historical truth about the civil wars' martyrs, and the religious truth to which they had witnessed, and in light of that remembrance, continue to affirm the prominent position and central role of the Church in national affairs.

---

[193] Champion, 'Religion's safe,' 553.

VIII.

Conclusion

In December 1704 John Riland, the son of a clergyman, penned a letter containing a remarkable story about his late father. One day in the late 1640s Rev. Riland had been met on the road by a party of Parliamentary soldiers. A member of the group had ridden up to Riland, 'drew a pistol, cock't it and presented it to his face and askt him who he was for?' The minister had answered, 'you know who I am for,' at which point the soldier fired his pistol; miraculously, the bullet missed Riland's head, although it set his hair and hat on fire. Riland was so thankful for what he understood had been 'so great a deliverance' that 'he kept an annual commemoration of it, as long as he lived, which he observed by feasting his neighbours and feeding the poor.' Riland's son wrote that each year before his father's thanksgiving meal began, he would give his guests 'a short account of his great Deliverance that Day, and of his other troubles he suffered in the civil warrs.' Evidently Rev. Riland had commemorated his near-death experience with this ritual meal until he expired in 1672.[1]

This anecdote about a civil war survivor who sponsored an annual feast at which he would recount to his community his sufferings and providential preservation from Parliament's 'sanguinary Reformers' epitomizes the dialectic traced in this study of the political and social contexts within which remembering the late troubled times occured and the contents of what was remembered. The actions of remembering the civil wars and Interregnum in letters, on petitions and wounded bodies, in legal testimony, through historical writings, and in public story-telling were shaped and constrained by wider circumstances. For example, Riland's commemorative act of charity was an expression of the paternalistic ethic which framed much of the social interactions between the better and the lower sorts throughout the seventeenth century.[2] Nevertheless, as acts of remembering they were purposeful attempts to re-shape the context in which the troubled past was known and brought to bear meaningfully on the community's present circumstances. In Rev. Riland's case it seems clear that his story of deliverance from Parliamentary violence was intended to emphasize for his parish community, especially its weaker members, the benefits of the peace and safety they presently enjoyed under the restored monarchy, as well as highlighting God's vindication of the established Church, demonstrated by Riland's preservation through his suffering. By linking the religious regime created by the Long Parliament with disorder, violence and rebellion, Riland's story would have supported a politics of the parish in which the non-propertied were increasingly excluded by their social betters from having a voice in its public affairs.[3]

---

[1] Bodl. Lib. MS J Walker c.1, f. 124. Riland's thanksgiving feast has obvious parallels with aspects of Holy Communion, a meal at which Christians remember the sufferings of Jesus for their salvation. For the importance of county feasts and feast sermons as rituals of social affirmation and politicization in Restoration England see Newton Key, 'The political culture and political rhetoric of county feasts and feast sermons, 1654-1714' *Journal of British Studies* 33 (1994), 223-56.

This study has been concerned with examples of what can be called social or public remembering. That is, it has not sought to discover post-Restoration memories of the civil wars lodged within the minds of participants or subsequently retained by their descendants, but rather it has concentrated on a select number of occasions, the contexts within and purposes for which particular persons narrated aspects of the late troubled times. The records of these acts of remembering and the stories they conveyed were generated to a greater or lesser extent in the open, and were intended to have an influence both for and beyond the remembering person. The defaulting accountants used the government's own rhetoric about the past to create for themselves a semi-public testimony and subsequent record of indemnity. Restoration Remembrancers wrote national and personal histories that recorded recent public events, taught readers the applicability of general principles and rules to England's particular recent catastrophe, and encouraged the public to think about the wars in terms of guilty parties which still posed a danger to the nation. Wounded royalist veterans testified and then submitted petitions to secure for themselves a public benefit, a pension, while becoming corporeal reminders of the kind of principles and actions the nation's governors wanted to encourage after the Restoration, especially after the Parliamentary victories of the Whigs between 1679 and 1681. The practical ambition of much civil war historical writing during the early 1680s was to become memorable images through which the reading public ought to view political affairs in the present and judge which party offered the best way forward. Similarly, civil war histories published after the end of pre-publication censorship, were largely concerned with identifying the guilty and innocent parties in order to identify the party or religious group that represented the greatest present danger to the post-Revolution polity and the true national interest. Finally, the letters written to John Walker, conveying stories of civil war Anglican suffering based largely upon the testimonies of local informants, were intended to vindicate the Church's continuing status as the nation's true Christian community in an era of religious toleration.

---

[2] Steve Hindle 'The Growth of Social Stability in Restoration England' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 568-9.

[3] Hindle, 'Growth of Social Stability,' 572-3; Keith Wrightson, 'The Politics of the Parish in Early Modern England' in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle (eds.) *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), 31-5.

Although many, perhaps most, English people might have wished that the civil wars had never happened—the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was the closest the nation came to making that wish come true—it is clear that from the very beginning of the

Restoration period the memory of the troubled times was evoked and put to use for a variety of political and religious ends. The polemical utility of narrating the wars and Interregnum ensured they would not become late Stuart England's 'elephant in the room.'[4] This dissertation has explored some of the ways that the social circulation of civil war memories was constrained by political and social circumstances, as well as the media through which recollections were issued into the public domain in the hope of transforming the English polity, or holding back the forces of change. As aspects of the English polity changed after 1660, so too did the reasons for remembering the wars; for example, stories of puritan iconoclasm during the 1640s, related by James Heath and Sir William Dugdale, would have served to justify the penal laws against Nonconformists from the 1660s through to the late 1680s, whereas after the Toleration Act of 1689 they might be recounted by one of John Walker's correspondents to prove the hypocrisy of Dissenters, and the threat they still posed to Christian faith. Similarly, tales of the king's fiscal innovations during the 1630s, or of the punishments meted out to Burton, Bastwick and Prynne, could be marshalled by Edmund Ludlow and John Rushworth to vindicate the Long Parliament's recourse to arms, while in the late 1690s Roger Coke might highlight these features of the king's personal rule to attack the prospect of a Jacobite restoration. A maimed royalist's story of faithful service and wounding in 1663 might have got him a place among the community of the king's pensioners, while in 1681 a much older veteran's testimony would have confirmed his adherence to the Tory party.

---

[4] Eviatar Zerubavel, *The Elephant in the Room: Silence and Denial in Everyday Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Thus the same events or stories could serve different ends depending on the context, both social and temporal, in which it was told.[5]

In at least two important respects testimonies and histories about the wars were remembered for similar reasons, and evinced similar properties throughout the late seventeenth century. First, during the period stories were put abroad which vindicated one set of principles and its adherents, and vilified the doctrines of its opponents. A number of these explanatory narratives, particularly those accounting for the origin of the parties responsible for the conflict and also those commemorating the sacrifices of political and religious martyrs, were intended to create and to sustain the reader's attachment to a particular community of principle. Others, especially national histories, but also the testimonies of maimed royalist veterans, were efforts to articulate the principles that truly defined the nation, showing who and what 'we' were in distinction from who and what 'the others' were.[6] Such stories often made sharper distinctions between protagonists and antagonists than actually had been the case during the troubles, so that the ideological and moral gaps between the communities appeared wider than they were in reality. Fracture, conflict and partisanship were not necessarily the hallmarks of England's political culture during and after the civil wars, even if they seem to have been hallmarks of the public recollections of the troubled times examined here.[7]

Second, the endurance of explanatory narratives in English historical writing to make sense of the wars led to an Indian summer of analogical-typological perceptions of the relationship between past and present. Despite attempts at the Restoration to turn back the constitutional clock to 1641, and to move forward as though there had been no rupture, it was clear to most English people that the present political and religious landscape had been transformed by recent events.[8] Nonetheless, especially within royalist-Anglican historical writing, the past was still perceived as a mirror of the present, reflecting events and figures which paralleled contemporary affairs.[9] That is not to say that Dissenters and Whigs after the Restoration were understood by their critics only to be mirrors of civil-war puritans and Parliamentarians, but rather that Dissenters and Whigs were seen to be what can be called causal types.[10] That is, within historical writing hostile towards puritans and Parliamentarians these figures from the past were presented as the manifest causal type of the troubles whose Dissenter and later Whiggish descendants represented a latent causal anti-type of another fall into chaos. The historical figures behind fears of 'popery and arbitrary government' were perhaps similar causal types, by the end of the century understood to be latent among Jacobites and manifest in France.

---

[5] I thank Daniel Woolf for this summative point.
[6] David Carr, *Time, Narrative and History* (Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press, 1986), 48-51.
[7] See John Miller, 'Containing Division in Restoration Norwich' *English Historical Review* 121 (2006), 1019-47.

I have examined instances of public remembering and the ways such narrations about the recently ruptured past to broaden our understanding of how late seventeenth-century people made sense of their times. Taken together, the examples from legal testimony, petitions, letters and histories might be said to shed light on public memory in later Stuart England, provided that public memory is understood not to stand for a singular or monolithic entity, as is implied by Jonathan Scott.[11] As a species of social memory, public memory is rather a perpetual process of creating and supporting representations of the past; as a set of practices public memory cannot be thought to have the essential continuity of an individual human being.[12] Public memory, in other words, is always in motion, driven by the dialectic of contexts which call forth remembrances and the spoken, written or printed recollections which attempt to alter, even if slightly, those same wider contexts.

---

[8] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 2005), 135.

[9] Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 126; Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 23-5; Mark Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 356.

[10] Daniel Woolf, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Enlightenment' in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume III: 1400-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

It is apparent that in the future it would be fruitful for historians to explore the emergence of post-civil war remembering publics, that is to say, groups whose membership was open to anyone interested in the process of developing and sustaining knowledge about the ruptured past in and for the present; such groups would have co-existed, often uneasily, in Restoration and early Augustan England.[13] Scholars have already shown that publics and their opinions were increasingly invoked by later Stuart England's rulers in order to govern effectively.[14] The cry '41 is come again' was employed by propagandists such as Roger L'Estrange to represent the beginning of a national disaster; it could also have been recalled as the timely end of a catastrophic experiment in non-Parliamentary government. In other words, the slogan as L'Estrange used it had a particular public in mind, one that would countenance efforts, somewhat ironically, to restrict the amount of public discussion concerning the implications of a

---

[11] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000), 17-9.

[12] Wulf Kansteiner, "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies" in *History and Theory* 41 (2002), 179-97; Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and memory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 17.

[13] Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002), 66.

[14] Tim Harris, 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 506-10; Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5-85, 24-5, 57-62, 67-107.

Catholic heir.[15] One significant legacy, therefore, of what used to be called the English Revolution was an understanding among members of the political establishment that stories and images from the troubled past could be employed to create or sustain principled public support for particular policies.

Events and figures from the civil war years were periodically narrated throughout the late Stuart period as what might be called countermeasures against principles and groups considered to be a danger to the public. It is claimed by some historians that knowledge of the mid-century troubles, gained from personal experience, testimony or historical writing, enabled English people to resolve subsequent political crises without resorting to violence.[16] For example, the absence of partisanship in local politics before the mid-1670s has been interpreted as proof that the wars fostered consensus and compromise.[17] Futhermore, while the level of violence during the Glorious Revolution has arguably been underplayed by historians, it is true that after 1660 England did not experience another contest of killing and injuring like it had during the 1640s.[18] Since I have not touched upon the difficult problem of reception, that is, how narratives of the troubled past were received, contested, or redeployed for different ends, my analysis does not provide evidence that demonstrates the utility of the civil war past for social and political peace. Nonetheless, it perhaps helpful to remember that had James II not lost his nerve on the Salisbury plain in November 1688, and had his and his son-in-law's armies engaged in combat, historians might have subsequently argued that the memories of the civil wars spurred on a cycle of political violence in England well into the eighteenth century.[19] Certainly, representations of a ruptured past have provoked repeated recourses to violence in other European countries, Ireland being the nearest example. It is perhaps England's *sonderweg* to reap a peaceful harvest, at least domestically, from the seeds of its people's civil war memories and yet, but for personal traits of James II and William of Orange, such recollections might have yielded further fields of blood.[20]

---

[15] Geoff Kemp, 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere,' in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 67-90.

[16] Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford Universityn Press, 2000), 795; Jason McElligott, 'Introduction: Stabilizing and Destabilizing Britain in the 1680s' in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 5-6.

[17] John Miller, *After the Civil Wars: English Politics and Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

[18] Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 295-304; Steven Pincus, *England's Glorious Revolution* (Forthcoming).

The argument and analysis of this work derives from evidence retrieved from a narrow trench dug in the soil of seventeenth-century English social memory. There is much labour remaining to be done on the transmission and reception of accounts of the broken times in diaries, sermons, speeches, polemical or periodic literature, ballads, poetry, drama and letters, to list only the obvious. Further explorations are required into the ways narratives about the civil wars were contested, and the extent to which they were appropriated by individuals into their personal memory. Scottish, Irish and the British contexts of civil war remembering and historical writing remain to be investigated and compared, while more micro-studies of Restoration-era communities should shed light on local representations of the troubled past and its reverberations within parish and country publics.[21] While such studies will deepen our understanding of early modern historical culture, they will also, it seems to me, expand a particular moral community:

---

[19] J. G. A. Pocock, 'The Significance of 1688: some reflections on Whig history' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 271-92.

[20] Tony Claydon, *William III* (London: Longman, 2002), 2-5.

[21] Daniel C. Beaver, *Parish Communities and Religious Conflict in the Vale of Gloucester, 1590-1690* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Phil Withington, 'Citizens, community and political culture in Restoration England' in Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (eds.), *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 134-55.

long dead people whom we in the present choose to remember.[22] In other words, the turn to memory in recent historical scholarship will be worthwhile ultimately not only for encouraging historians to study the ways women and men long ago made sense of their experience of time, but also for making known to the present people such as Major William Norton, Owen Dod, John Riland, and Grace Batishill. They were like us in wanting to tell true stories about the past, and acted upon that impulse although at times under very difficult circumstances.[23] Such acts of remembering deserve to be rescued from oblivion, even if, as Neitzsche argued, present life requires that many similar attempts to narrate the past remain forgotten. Furthermore, if we modern historians, unlike these seventeenth-century people, do not believe that historical truths necessarily bear moral implications, it is nonetheless true that an effort to discover and to understand such individuals and their narrations can, and ought to, enrich our experience and interpretation of the present, which indeed has its own fair share of troubles.[24]

---

[22] Avashi Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 3-12.

[23] John Arnold, *History: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8.

[24] David Gross, *Lost Time: On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000), 141-3.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

I. Manuscript Sources

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS J. Walker

Chester and Cheshire Record Office, Chester

Quarter Sessions Judicial Files 89-105

Devonshire Record Office, Exeter

Quarter Session files, 128/1-147

House of Lords Record Office, London

Manuscript Journal of the House of Commons, HL/CL/JO/1/33: 2 September 1648 to 13 June 1649

The National Archives, Kew

E 113, King's Remembrancer: Bills and Answers Against Defaulting Accountants, 1660-1685.

North Yorkshire Record Office, Northallerton

Quarter Session Bundles, 1686-1690

West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield

Quarter Session files, 1/7 to 1/26

Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, Chippenham

Quarter Session Great Rolls, A1/110, 1660-1685

II. Printed Sources

A) Legislation

Great Britain. *The Statues of the Realm: 1225-1713*, London: Dawsons, 1963.

Kenyon, J. P. ed. *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

B) Historical writings

An abridgment of Sr. Richard Bakers Chronicle of the kings of England in a succinct history of the successions of the English monarchy., London: Printed for John Kidgell, and are to be sold by Richard Janeway, 1684. [Wing B499]

Astell, Mary. *An impartial enquiry into the causes of rebellion and civil war in this kingdom: In an examination of Dr. Kennett's sermon, Jan. 31. 1703/4. And Vindication of the Royal Martyr.* London printed by E. P. for R. Wilkin, at the Kings-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1704. [ESTC T000820]

Bate, George. *Elenchus motuum nuperorum in Anglia: or, A short historical account of the rise and progress of the late troubles in England. In two parts. Written in Latin by Dr. George Bates, principal physician to K. Charles the I. and K. Charles the II. Motus compositi: or, The history of the composing the affairs of England by the restauration of K. Charles the Second, and the punishment of the regicides: and other principal occurrents to the year 1669. Written in Latin by Tho. Skinner, M.D. Made English. To which is added a preface by a person of quality, and in the body of th work several choice original papers, an account of which is given in the end of the preface.* Translated by Archibald Lovell. London: Abel Swalle, 1685. [Wing B1083]

Baxter, Richard. *An abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his life and times. With an account of many others ... By Edmund Calamy. ...* London: printed by S. Bridge, for Thomas Parkhurst. Jonathan Robinson. And John Lawrence, 1702. [ESTC T109211]

[Bethel, Slingsby]. *The world's mistake in Oliver Cromwell*, London: 1668. [Wing B2070]

Berkeley, John. *Memoirs of Sir John Berkley, containing an account of his negotiation with Lieut, General Cromwel, ...* London :printed by J. Darby in Bartholomew-Close, for A. Baldwin in Warwicklane, 1699. [Wing B1971]

C[hurchill],W[inston?]. *History of the Commons Warre of England*, London: Joshua Coniers, 1662. [Wing C4275aA]

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of. *The history of the rebellion and civil wars in England begun in the year 1641 With the precedent passages and actions that contributed thereunto. In five books...Faithfully abridg'd. With and alphabetical index.* London: John Nutt, 1703. ESTC N007482]

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, first Earl of., *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon, Lord High Chancellor of England, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Being a Continuation of His History of the Grand Rebellion from the Restoration to his Banishment in 1667.* Third Edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1761.

Coke, Roger. *The detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns, and the Inter-regnum. The Second Edition corrected. To which are added many other secrets, never before made publick: as also, a more impartial account of the Civil Wars in England, than has yet been given.* London: 1696. [Wing C4974] (First edition published in 1694, Wing C4973)

Crouch, Nathaniel. *The Wars in England, Scotland and Ireland*, London: John How, 1681. [Wing C7357]

-----. *England's monarchs: or, A compendious relation of the most remarkable transactions, and observable passages, ecclesiastical, civil, and military, which have hapned during the reigns of the kings and queens of England, from the invasion of the Romans to this present. Adorne with poems, and the pictures of every monarch, from William the Conquerour, to His present Majesty, our gracious sovereign, King Charles the Second: together with the names of His Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council, the nobility, bishops, deans, and principal officers, civil and military, in England, in the year 1684. By R.B. author of the Admirable curiosities in England; The historical remarks in London and Westminster; The late wars in England, Scotland, and Ireland, &c.* London: Nathaniel Crouch, 1685. [Wing C7314]

D[avies], J[ohn?]. *The Civil Warres of Great Britain and Ireland*, London: R.W. for Philip Chetwind, 1661. [Wing D393]

Dryden, John. 'Dedication and Postscript' to *The history of the League. Written in French by Monsieur Maimbourg. Translated into English according to His Majesty's command by Mr. Dryden*. London: M. Flesher for Jacob Tonson, 1684. [Wing M292], in H.T. Swendenberg ed. *Works of John Dryden*, Volume 18. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

Dugdale, William. *A short view of the late troubles in England; briefly setting forth, their rise, growth, and tragical conclusion. As also, some parallel thereof with the barons-wars in the time of King Henry III. But chiefly with that in France, called the Holy League, in the reign of Henry III. and Henry IV. late kings of that realm. By Sir William Dugdale Kt. Garter King of Arms to which is added, a perfect narrative of the Treaty at Uxbridge in an. 1644. By the same author.* London: Moses Pitt, 1681. [Wing D2492]

Duke, Henry [Theophilus Rationalis]. *Multum in parvo, aut vox veritatis: wherein the principles, practices, and transactions of the English nation: but more especially and in particular by their representatives assembled in Parliament anno Domini 1640, 1641: as* *also 1680, 1681. are most faithfully and impartially examined, collected, and compared together for the present seasonable use, benefit and information of the publick. As also, the wonderful and most solemn manner and form of ratifying, confirming and pronouncing of that most dreadful curse and execration against the violaters ... Magna Charta in the time of Henry the Third, King of England, &c. All which is earnestly recommended to the most serious and impartial consideration, and perusal of all His Majesties most loyal, most obedient subjects ... within his realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions and territories thereunto belonging. By Theophilus Rationalis, a person of quality, and a most true lover of his king and country.* London, Rich. Janeway, 1681. [Wing M3061]

Eglesfield, Francis. *Monarchy Revived*, London: Roger Daniel, 1661. [Wing E254]

Fairfax, Thomas. *Short Memorials of Thomas Lord Fairfax*, London: Richard Chiswell, 1699. [Wing F235]

Firth, C.H. ed. Newcastle, Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, to Which is Added the True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life*, London: Routledge, 1906.

[Fletcher, Henry]. *The Perfect Politician: Or, a Full View of the Life and Actions (Military and Civil) of O. Cromwell. Containing also a History of the late Civil War, so far as he was concerned therein*, London: 1680. [Wing F1335] (First edition published in February 1660, Wing 1334 and TT E.1869[1])

[Frankland, Thomas]. *The annals of King James and King Charles the First. Both of happy memory· Containing a faithful history, and impartial account of the great affairs of state, and transactions of parliaments in England, from the tenth of King James, M.DC.XII. to the eighteenth of King Charles, M.DC.XL.II. Wherein several material passages, relating to the late civil wars, (omitted in former histories) are made known*, London: Tho. Braddyll for Robert Clavel, 1681. [Wing F2078]

Fullman, William and Richard Perrinchief eds. *Basilika,* London: 1662. [Wing C 2075]

Gumble, Thomas. *Life of General Monck, Duke of Albermarle*, London: J.S. for Thomas Bassett, 1671. [Wing G2230]

Heath, James. *A Brief Chronicle of all the chief Action so fatally falling out in these three Kingdoms*, London: John Best, 1662. [Wing H1318]

-----. *A Chronicle of the late Intestine War in the three Kingdoms*, Second edition, London: John Best, 1663. [Wing H 1319]

-----. *Flagellum: The life and death, birth and burial of Oliver Cromwell, the late Usurper*, London: L.R., 1663. [Wing H1328]

-----. *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, London: R.H., 1665 (?). [Wing H1336]

Herbert, Thomas. *Memoirs of the two last years of the reign of that unparallell'd prince, of ever blessed memory, King Charles I. By Sir Tho. Herbert, Major Huntington, Col. Edw. Coke, and Mr. Hen. Firebrace. With the character of that blessed martyr, by The Reverend John Diodati, Mr. Alexander Henderson, and the author of The princely-pelican. To which is added, The Death-Bed Repentance of Mr. Lenthal, Spenher of the Long-Parliament; Extracted out of a Letter written from Oxford, Sept. 1662* London : printed for Robert Clavell, 1702. [ESTC T072442]

Heylyn, Peter. *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death, of The most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William.. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury...*, London: For A. Seile, 1668. [Wing H1699]

-----. *Aerius redivius: or the history of the Presbyterians...from the year 1536 to the year 1647*, Oxford: John Crosley, 1670. [Wing H1681]

The history of England faithfully extracted from authentick records, approved manuscripts, and the most celebrated histories of this kingdom, in all languages, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil. With the effigies of all the kings and queens of England, from the Norman Race, to the present Time; Curiously Engraved on Copper-Plates from Original Medals and Pictures. In two volumes. London: printed for Isaac Cleave, in Chancery-Lane, Abel Roper, A. Bosvile, and Richard Basset, in Fleetstreet, 1702 [ESTC T114544]

Hobbes, Thomas. *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, London: Edited by Ferdinand Tonnies, with an Introduction by Stephen Homes, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990.

Holles, Denzil. *Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, Baron of Ifield in Sussex, from the year 1641, to 1648*. London: printed for Tim. Goodwin at the Queen's Head, against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-street, 1699. [Wing H2464]

Jones, David. *A Continuation of the Secret History of White-Hall;...Together with the Tragical History of the Stuarts, from the first Rise of that Family*, London: printed, and are to be sold by R. Baldwin, in Warwick-lane,1697. [Wing J929]

Keeble, N. H. ed. Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, London: J.M. Dent, 1995.

Kennett, White. *A compassionate enquiry into the causes of the Civil War. In a sermon preached in the church of St. Botolph Algate, on January XXXI, 1703/4. ...* London: printed and sold by H. Hills, 1704 [ESTC T132813]

L'Estrange, Roger. *A memento. Treating of the rise, progress, and remedies of seditions: with some historical reflections upon the series of our late troubles*. London: Joanna Brome, 1682. [Wing L1271]

Lloyd, David. *Memoirs of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings and Deaths of Those Noble, Revered, and Excellent Personages That Suffered…In our late Intestine Wars*, London: Samuel Speed, 1668. [Wing L2642]

[May, Thomas]. *Arbitrary government displayed to the life, in the tyrannic usurpation of a junto of men called the Rump Parliament. And more especially in that of the tyrant and usurper, Oliver Cromwell. In which you have a clear view of the arbitrary, illegal, and unjust proceedings, of those persons under the notion of liberty. And a compendious history of those times, faithfully collected. With the characters and lives of several of those usurpers, and a brief account of the several persons that suffered death, and imprisonment under them for their loyalty to their king and country. And by which may be seen the difference between arbitrary usurpers and lawful kings reigning by, and according to the laws of the land. Illustrated with several brass cutts, representing the chief persons, and passages therein* London: Charles Leigh, 1682. [Wing A3597 and M1416A]

Nalson, John. *An impartial collection of the great affairs of state, from the beginning of the Scotch rebellion in the year MDCXXXIX. To the murther of King Charles I. Wherein the first occasions, and the whole series of the late troubles in England, Scotland, & Ireland, are faithfull represented. Taken from authentick records, and methodically digested, by John Nalson, LL.D. Vol. I. Published by his Majesties special command* , 2 vols., London: S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke, T. Sawbridge and C. Mearne, 1682. [Wing N106]

-----, *A True Copy of the Journal of the High Court of Justice, for the trial of K. Charles I*, London: H[enry] C[lark] for Thomas Dring, 1684. [Wing T2645 and N116]

Phillips, Edward. 'The reign of King Charles' in Sir Richard Baker, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England*, London: Ellen Cotes for George Saubridg, 1665. [Wing B504A]

Rochester, Lawrence Hyde, earl of. 'Prefaces' *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641…Written by the Right Honourable Edward Earl of Clarendon…*Oxford: 1702-1704.

Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections: Second Part,* 2 volumes, London: J.D. for John Wright and Richard Chiswell, 1680. [Wing R2318]

-----. *The Tryal of Thomas, Earl of Strafford…upon an Impeachment of High Treason*, London: John Wright and Richard Chiswell, 1680. [Wing T2232]

Sprat, Thomas. *History of the Royal Society*, London: J. Martyn, 1667. Jackson I. Cope and Harold W. Jones eds. St Louis: Washington University Press, 1959.

[Seller, John]. *The History of England. Giving a True and Impartial Account of the most Considerable Transactions in Church and State, in Peace and War, during the Reigns of* all the Kings and Queens…, London: printed for John Gwillim, 1696. [Wing S2474aA]

[Toland, John]. *King Charles I. No such Saint, Martyr, or Good Protestant as commonly reputed*…London: 1698. [Wing J7]

Walker, Edward. *Historical Discourses, upon several occasions: viz. 1. The happy progress and success of the arms of K. Charles I.*, London: W.B. for Sam. Keble, 1705. [ESTC T097417]

Warwick, Philip. *Memoires of the reigne of King Charles I. With a continuation to the happy restauration of King Charles II. By Sir Philip Warwick, Knight. Published from the original manuscript. With an alphabetical tabl*e London: printed for Ri. Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1701. [ESTC T063889]

[Winstanley, William]. *The Loyal Martyrology; or Brief Catalogues and Characters of the most Eminent Persons who Suffered for their Conscience during the late times of Rebellion*…, London: Thomas Mabb, for Edward Thomas 1665. [Wing W3066]

Wellwood, James. *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England, for the Last Hundred Years, Preceding the Revolution of 1688*, London: Tim Goodwin, 1700. [Wing W1306]

Worden, A.B. ed. *Edmund Ludlow: A voice from the Watchtower: part five: 1660-1662*, London: Royal Historical Society, 1978.

Whitelocke, Bulstrode. *Memorials of the English Affairs: or, An Historical Account of what passed from the beginning of the Reign of King Charles I, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration*, London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682. [Wing W1986]

Secondary Sources

I. Articles and Books

Achinstein, Sharon. *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

---. '"When civil fury first grew high": Politics and Incivility in the Restoration,' in Jennifer Richards ed. *Early Modern Civil Discourses* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003: 85-98.

Amussen, Susan Dwyer. '"The part of a Christian man": the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England' in Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky eds. *Political culture and cultural politics in early modern England*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995: 213-33.

Ankersmit, Frank. 'Statements, Texts and Pictures,' in F. R. Ankersmit and Hans Kellner eds. *A New Philosophy of History*, London: Reaktion Books, 1995: 212-240.

-----. 'The Sublime Dissociation of the Past: or How to Be(come) What One is No Longer,' *History and Theory* 40 (2001), 295-323.

-----. '"Presence" and Myth,' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 317-327.

Appleby, David. J. 'Unnecessary persons? Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex, 1642-1662,' *Essex Archaeology and History* 32 (2001), 209-21.

Arni, Eric Gruber Von. *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: nursing, medical care and welfare for sick and wounded soldiers and their families during the English civil war and interregnum, 1642-1660*, Aldershot: Ashgate Press, 2001.

Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's* Two Treatises of Government, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Ashplant, T. G. 'Anecdote as narrative resource in working-class life stories: parody, dramatization and sequences' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson eds. *Narrative and Genre*, New York: Routledge, 1998: 99-113.

Astbury, Raymond. 'The Renewal of the Licensing Act in 1693 and its Lapse in 1695,' *The Library, Fifth Series* 33 (1978), 296-322.

Atherton, Ian. '"The Itch Grown a Disease": manuscript transmission of news in the seventeenth century' in Joad Raymond ed. *News, newspapers and society in early modern Britain*, London: Cass, 1999: 39-59.

Baldwin, Geoff. 'The "public" as a rhetorical community in early modern England,' in Alexandra Walsham and Phil Withington eds. *Communities in early modern England*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000: 199-215.

Bannet, Eva Tavor. '"Secret History": Or, Talebearing Inside and Outside the Secretorie,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 375-396.

Bennett, G. V. *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Borot, Luc. 'Hobbes's *Behemoth*,' in G. A. J. Rogers and Tom Sorell (eds.) *Hobbes and History*, London: Routledge, 2000: 137-146.

Bourke, Joanna. *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War*, London: Reaktion Books, 1996.

-----. 'Effeminacy, Ethnicity, and the End of Trauma: The Sufferings of "Shell-Shocked" Men in Great Britain and Ireland, 1914-39,' *Journal of Contemporary History* 35 (2000), 57-69.

Braddick, M. J. *Parliamentary Taxation in Seventeenth-Century England: Local Administration and Response*, Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 1994.

-----. *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

-----. 'Administrative performance: the representation of political authority in early modern England,' in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter eds. *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 166-187.

Branco, Maria João Violante. 'Memory and truth: the strange case of the witness enquiries of 1216 in the Braga-Toledo dispute,' *Historical Research*, 79 (February 2006), 1-20.

Brockelman, P. 'Of Memory and Things Past,' *International Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (1975), 309-25.

Brownley, Martine Watson. *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

-----. 'Sir Richard Baker's "Chronicle" and Later Seventeen-Century English Historiography' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52 (1989), 481-500.

Bruner, Jerome. 'The Narrative Construction of Reality'' *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1991), 1-21.

Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Bryson, W.H. *The Equity Side of the Exchequer: its jurisdiction, administration, procedures and records*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1975.

Cambers, Andrew. 'Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580-1720,' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 796-825.

Carlton, Charles 'The Impact of Fighting' in John Morrill ed. *The Impact of the English Civil War*, London: Collins & Brown, 1991: 17-31.

-----. *Going to the wars: the experience of the British civil wars*, London: Routlege, 1992.

Carr, David. *Time, Narrative, and History*, Bloomington: Indiana University, 1986.

de Certeau, Michel. *L'Étranger, ou l'union dans la difference*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1991.

Chalmers, Hero. *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Chamberlain, Mary, and Paul Thompson eds. *Narrative and Genre*, New York: Routledge, 1988.

Champion, J. A. I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: the Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

-----. 'Religion's safe, with priestcraft is the war': Augustan anti-clericalism and the legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720,' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 547-61.

-----. *Republican learning: John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Churches, Christine. '"The Most Unconvincing Testimony:" The genesis and historical usefulness of the country depositions in Chancery' in *The Seventeenth Century* 11 (1996): 209-227.

Clanchy, M. I. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Clark, E. R. 'Re-reading the Exclusion Crisis,' *The Seventeenth Century* (2007), 141-159.

Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1996.

-----. 'The sermon, the "public sphere" and the political culture of late seventeenth century England,' in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough eds. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, literature and history, 1600-1750*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000: 208-34.

-----. *William III*, London: Longman, 2002.

Collinson, P. 'Biblical Rhetoric: The English nation and national sentiment in the prophetic mode' in Claire MacEachern and Debora Shuger (eds.). *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997: 15-45.

Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989.

Cooter, Roger. 'The Disabled Body' in R. Cooter and J. V. Pickstone eds. *Medicine in the Twentieth Century*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998: 367-83.

Cover, Robert M. 'Foreword: *Nomos* and Narrative,' *Harvard Law Review* (1983), 4-68.

Crawford, Patricia. *Denzil Holles, 1598-1680: a study of his political career*, London: Royal Historical Society, 1979.

-----. *Blood, Bodies and Families*, Harlow: Longman, 2004.

Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National memory and Protestant culture in Elizabethan and Stuart England*, Berkeley: University of California, 1989.

Crist, Timothy. 'Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679,'*Publishing History* 5 (1979), 49-77.

Crook, B. M. 'May, Thomas (c. 1645-1718)' in Basil D. Henning (ed.), *The History of Parliament, The House of Commons 1660-1690 Volume III: Members, M-Y* London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983: 38.

Cross, Claire. 'The Church in England, 1646-1660,' in G.E. Aylmer ed. *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660*, London: Macmillan, 1972: 99-120.

Cubitt, Geoffrey. *History and memory*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

-----. 'The Political Uses of Seventeenth-century English History in Bourbon Restoration France,' *Historical Journal* 50 (2007), 1-23.

Cust, Richard. 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings,' *Past and Present* no. 149 (1995), 57-94.

Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1996), 201-213.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon tales and their tellers in sixteenth-century France*, Oxford: Polity Press, 1987.

Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, empire and the imagining of masculinities*, London: Routledge, 1994.

Dear, Peter. 'From Truth to Disinterestedness in the Seventeenth Century,' *Social Studies of Science* 22 (1992), 619-31.

De Krey, Gary S. *London and the Restoration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Derrida, Jaques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Translated by E. Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996.

Domanska, Ewa. 'The Material Presence of the Past,' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 337-348.

Donagan, Barbara. 'The casualties of war: treatment of the dead and wounded in the English Civil War,' in Ian Gentles, John Morrill and Blair Worden eds. *Soldiers, writers and statesmen of the English Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998: 114-132.

-----. 'The web of honour: soldiers, Christians, and gentlemen in the English civil war,' *Historical Journal* 44 (2001), 365-89.

Douglas, David C. *English Scholars, 1660-1730*, London: Eyre and Spottishwoode, 1951.

Dragstra, Henk, Sheila Ottway and Helen Wilcox eds. *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000.

Engel, W.E. *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England*, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1995.

Errington, Shelley. 'Some Comments on Style in the Meanings of the Past' *Journal of Asian Studies* 38 (1979), 231-244.

Escobedo, A. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 2004.

Fentress, James and Chris Wickham. *Social Memory*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter McCullough. 'Revising the study of the English sermon,' in idem eds. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, literature and history, 1600-1750*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000: 2-21.

Finlayson, Michael. 'Clarendon, providence and historical revolution,' *Albion* 22 (1990), 607-32.

Finnegan, Ruth. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.

Firth, C. H. 'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion,' *English Historical Review* 19 (1904), 26-54; 246-62; 464-483.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England: 1500-1800*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Thomas S. Freeman, 'Introduction: Over their Dead Bodies: Concepts of Martyrdom in Late-Medieval and Early-Modern England' in Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (eds.) *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 1-34.

-----, 'Imitatio Christi with a Vengeance: The Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early-Modern England' in Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (eds.) *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 35-69.

Foyster, Elizabeth. *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*, London: Longman, 1999.

Fox, Adam. *Oral and Literate Culture in England: 1500-1700*, Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Gentles, Ian. *The new model army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

-----'Parliamentary politics and the politics of the street: the London peace campaigns of 1642-43,' *Parliamentary History* 26 (2007), 139-59.

Gibson, William. *The Church of England, 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, London: Routledge, 2001.

Gillis, John R. 'Memory and Identity: The history of a relationship,' in John R. Ellis ed. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994, 3-24

Goldie, Mark. 'The Revolution of 1688 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1983), 473-564.

-----. 'Danby, the Bishops and the Whigs' in Tim Harris, Mark Goldie and Paul Seaward eds. *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, London: Blackwell, 1990: 75-107.

-----. 'The Theory of Religion Intolerance in Restoration England,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke eds. *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991: 331-368.

-----. 'Priestcraft and the birth of Whiggism,' in Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner eds. *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 209-231.

-----. 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England,' in Tim Harris ed. *The Politics of the Excluded, c. 1500-1850,* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001: 153-194.

Gowing, Laura. *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in seventeenth-century England*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Grafton, Anthony. *What Was History? The art of history in early modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Green, I. M. 'The persecution of "scandalous and "malignant" parish clergy during the English Civil War,' *English Historical Review* (1979): 507-531.

Green, Ian. 'The Publication of Clarendon's Autobiography and the acquisition of his papers by the Bodleian Library,' *Bodleian Library Record* 10 (1982), 349-367.

Gregory, Bradley S. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University, 1999.

Griggs, Burke. 'Remembering the Puritan Past: John Walker and Anglican Memories of the English Civil War' in M.C. McClendon, J.P. Ward, and M. MacDonald (eds.) *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*, Stanford: Stanford University, 1999: 158-191.

de Groot, Jerome. *Royalist Identities*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004.

Gross, David. *Lost Time: On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. 'Presence Achieved in Language (with special attention given to the presence of the past),' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 317-327.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Edited, translated, and with an introduction by Lewis Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992.

Harris, Tim. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Partly Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*, London: Longman, 1993.

-----. 'Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories Get Off Scott Free,' *Albion* 25 (1993), 581-590.

-----. 'The Legacy of the English Civil War: Rethinking the Revolution,' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 501-14.

-----. 'Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain,' in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus eds. *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 125-153.

-----. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, New York: Allen Lane, 2005.

-----. *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, London: Allen Lane, 2006.

Harvey, Karen. 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800,' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 296-311.

Helgerson, R. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992.

Henderson, Francis. '"Posterity to Judge'—John Rushworth and his Historical Collections,' *Bodleian Library Record* 15 (1996): 247-59.

Hayton, D.'The "country interest" and the party system, 1689-c. 1720,' in C. Jones ed. *Party and management in Parliament 1660-1784*, London: History of Parliament, 1984: 7-85.

Hicks, P. *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume*, New York: St. Martin's, 1996.

Hill, Christopher. *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*, New York: Viking, 1984.

Hindle, Steve. 'Exhortation and entitlement: negotiating inequality in English rural communities, 1550-1650,' in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter eds. *Negotiating power in early modern society : order, hierarchy and subordination in Britain and Ireland,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 102-22

-----. 'The Growth of Social Stability in Restoration England,' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 563-576.

Hirst, Derek. 'The Failure of Godly Rule in the English Republic,' *Past and Present* 132 (1991), 33-66.

-----. 'Remembering a Hero: Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs* of her Husband,' *English Historical Review* 119 (2002), 682-91.

-----. 'Making Contact: Petitions and the English Republic,' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006): 26-50.

-----. 'Bodies and Interests: Toleration and Political Imagination in the Later Seventeenth Century' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70 (2007), 401-426.

Holmes, Geoffrey. *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, Revised Edition London: Hambledon, 1987.

Hopper, Andrew. 'The Farnley Wood Plot and the memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire,' *Historical Journal* 45 (2002), 281-303.

-----. *Black Tom*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Hoppit, Julian. *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Horwitz, Henry. *Exchequer Equity Records and Procedures, 1649-1841*, Public Record office Handbook No. 32, London: Public Record Office, 2001.

Hudson, Geoffery L. 'Negotiating for blood money: war widows and the courts in seventeenth-century England' in Jennifer Kermode and Garthine Walker eds. *Women, crime and the courts in early modern England*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994: 146-174.

-----. 'Arguing Disability: ex-servicemen's stories in early modern England' in J. Pickstone and R. Bivins eds. *Medicine, Madness and Social History: Essays in Honour of Roy Porter*, London: Palgrave, 2007: 105-117.

Hutton, Patrick. *History as an Art of Memory*, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, 1993

Hutton, Ronald. 'Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*,' *English Historical Review* 97 (1982), 70-88.

-----. *The Restoration: a political and religious history of England and Wales, 1658-1667*, Oxford: Oxford University, 1985.

-----. *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

-----. *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: the ritual year, 1400-1700*, Oxford: Oxford University, 1994.

-----. *Debates in Stuart History*, London: Palgrave, 2005.

James, Mervyn. 'English politics and the concept of honour, 1485-1642' *Past and Present Supplement*, 1978.

Jenner, Mark S. R. and Bertrand O. Taithe. 'The Historiographical Body,' in Roger. Cooter and John V. Pickstone eds. *Medicine in the Twentieth Century*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998: 187-200.

Johnston, Warren. 'The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 467-501;

-----. 'Revelation and the Revolution of 1688-89,' *Historical Journal* 48 (2005), 351-89.

Jones, J. R. *Country and Court: England 1658-1714*, London: Edward Arnold, 1986.

Kansteiner, Wulf. 'Finding meaning in memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies,' *History and Theory* 41 (2002), 179-97.

Keeble, N. H. *Richard Baxter: puritan man of letters*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

-----. 'Introduction,' to N. H. Keeble (ed.) Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, London: J.M. Dent, 1995: xix-xxviii.

-----. *Restoration: England in the 1660s*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Kelley, D. R. 'The Theory of History' in Quentin Skinner and Eckhard Kessler eds. *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988: 746-761.

Kelley, D.R., and D.H. Sacks eds. *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric and Fiction, 1500-1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997.

Kelly, J. 'The Glorious and Immortal Memory: Commemoration and Protestant Identity in Ireland, 1660-1800,'*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, (1994): 25-52.

Kemp, Geoff. 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere,' in Jason McElligott ed. *Fear, exclusion and revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006: 67-90.

Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*, London: Heinemann, 1972.

-----. *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

-----. *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1993.

Kewes, Paulina. 'History and Its Uses: Introduction,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 1-33.

-----. 'Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law and National Memory in Early Restoration England' in Lorna Clymer (ed.) *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Institutions of Repetition in Euro-American Cultures*, Toronto: University of Toronto, 2006: 109-136.

Knights, Mark. 'Petitioning and Political Theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's "Monster" Petition of 1680,' *Past and Present* 138 (1993), 94-111.

-----. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1994.

-----. *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

-----. 'Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, Moderation and Zeal,' in Stephen Taylor and David L. Wykes eds. *Parliament and Dissent* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005: 41-58.

-----. 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 347-66.

-----. 'History and Literature in the Age of Defoe and Swift,' *History Compass* 3 (2005), 1-20.

Kolbrener, William. 'Gendering the Modern: Mary Astell's Feminist Historiography,' *The Eighteenth Century* 44 (2003), 1-24.

Koselleck, Reinhart. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Translated by Keith Tribe. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Koven, Seth. 'Remembering and Dismemberment: Crippled Children, Wounded Soldiers, and the Great War in Great Britain,' *American Historical Review* (1994), 1167-1202.

Kroen, Sheryl. *Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Memory after Auschwitz*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1998.

Lacey, Andrew. *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002.

Lake, Peter 'The Laudian style: order, uniformity and the pursuit of the beauty of holiness in the 1630s' in Kenneth Fincham ed. *The early Stuart church, 1603-1642*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993: 161-183.

Lake, Peter and Steven Pincus. 'Rethinking the Public Sphere,' in *Journal of British Studies* 45 (April 2006), 273-292.

Lamont, W. M. *Richard Baxter and the millennium: protestant imperialism and the English revolution*, Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.

-----. 'Richard Baxter, "Popery" and the origins of the English Civil War,' *History*, 87 (2002), 336-52.

-----. 'The religious origins of the English Civil War: two false witnesses,' in David J. B. Trim and Peter J. Balderstone eds. *Cross, crown & community : religion, government, and culture in early modern England, 1400-1800*, Oxford: Peter Lang, 2004: 177-96.

Laurence, Ann. '"This Sad and Deplorable Condition:" An attempt towards recovering an account of the sufferings of Northern clergy families in the 1640s and 1650s' in Diana Wood (ed.) *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c.1000-c.1700: Essays in Honour of Clair Cross*, Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999.

-----. '"Begging pardon for all mistakes or errors in this writing I being a woman and doing it myself:" Family narratives in some eighteenth-century letters,' in James Daybell ed. *Early Modern Women's Letter-Writing, 1450-1700* London: Palgrave, 2001: 194-206

Levine, Joseph M. *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Lewalski, Barbara K. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth Century Religious Lyric*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Llewellyn, Nigel. 'Honour in Life, Death and in the Memory: Funeral Monuments in Early Modern England,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1996), 179-200.

MacGillivray, Royce. *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War*, The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy: 1660-1671*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Maltby, Judith. '"By this Book:" Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the English Church,' in K. Fincham ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, London: Macmillan, 1993: 115-137.

Margalit, A. *The Ethics of Memory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2002.

Margolf, Diane C. 'Adjudicating Memory: Law and Religious Difference in early seventeenth-century France,' *Sixteenth Century Journal* 26 (1996), 399-418.

Martin, Jean-Clément. 'La Vendée, Région-Mémoire: bleus et blancs,' in Pierre Nora ed. *Les Lieux de Mémoire: La République*, Paris: Gallimard, 1984: 595-619.

Martinich, A. P. 'Presbyterians in *Behemoth*,' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 121-138.

Marshall, John. 'Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution,' *The European Legacy* 5 (2000), 515-30.

Mascuch, Michael. *The Origin of the Individual Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Mayer, Robert. 'Nathaniel Crouch, Bookseller and Historian: Popular Historiography and Cultural Power in Late Seventeen-Century England,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 27 (1994), 391-419.

McElligott, Jason, '"Several hundred squabbling tradesmen"? Censorship, The Stationers' Company, and the state in early modern England,' *Media History* 11 no. ½ (2005), 87-104.

-----.'Introduction: Stabilizing and Destabilizing Britain in the 1680s,' in Jason McElligott ed. *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006: 1-12.

-----. 'A New Model of Early-Modern Press Censorship,' Paper delievered at the University of York, September 2007.

McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel: 1600-1740*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Mendle, Michael. 'The "prints" of the Trials: The nexus of politics, religion, law and information in late seventeenth-century England' in Jason McElligott ed. *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006: 123-37.

Miller, John. *After the Civil Wars: English politics and government in the reign of Charles II*, Harlow: Longman, 2000.

-----. 'Containing Division in Restoration Norwich,' *English Historical Review* 121 (2006), 1019-1047.

Milton, Anthony. 'The creation of Laudianism : a new approach,' in Thomas Cogswell, Richard P. Cust and Peter Lake eds. *Politics, religion and popularity in early Stuart Britain : essays in honour of Conrad Russell*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002: 162-84.

Newman, P. N. 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle, and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism,' in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf eds. *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays presented to G.E. Aylmer*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1993: 225-241.

Nenner, Howard. 'The Trial of the Regicids: Retribution and Treason in 1660,' in *Politics and the Political Imagination in later Stuart Britain: Essays presented to Lois Green Schwoerer*, Howard Nenner ed. Rochester, NY: Rochester UP, 1997:21-42.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 'On the uses and disadvantages of history for life,' in *Untimely Meditations*, Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983: 59-123.

Nora, Pierre. *Lieux de memorie: Rethinking France.* Trans. Mary Trouille. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2001.

Norbrook, David. 'Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs*,' in David Womersley ed. *A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000: 182-188.

-----. 'The English Revolution and English Historiography,' in N. H. Keeble ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 233-250.

-----. '"Words more than civil": Republican Civility in Lucy Hutchinson's "The Life of John Hutchinson,"' in Jennifer Richards ed. *Early Modern Discourses*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003: 68-84.

Nuttall, G. F. *The Manuscript of the* Reliquiae Baxterianae, London: Dr William's Library, 1954.

Ohlmeyer, Jane and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the house of Ormond, and the politics of Anglo-Irish Patronage,' *Historical Journal* 49 (2006), 677-706.

Okie, Laird. *Augustan historical writing: histories of England in the English Enlightenment*, Lanham, MY: University Press of America, 1991.

Orr, Alan. *Treason and the State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Owen, Susan. 'Drama and Political Crisis' in Deborah Payne Fisk (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000: 159-173.

Parry, Graham. *The trophies of time: English antiquarians of the seventeenth century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Patterson, Annabel. *Reading Between the Lines*, London: Routledge, 1993.

-----. *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994

-----. *Early Modern Liberalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Peel, J.D.Y. '"For Who Hath Despised the Day of Small Things:" Missionary Narratives and Historical Anthropology,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37 (1995), 581-607.

Percival-Maxwell, Michael. 'The Anglesey-Ormond-Castlehaven Dispute, 1680-1682: taking sides about Ireland in England' in Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann eds.

Taking Sides: colonial and confessional mentalities in early modern Ireland, Dublin: 2003: 213-30.

Perry, Ruth. 'Mary Astell and Enlightenment,' in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor eds *Women, gender, and Enlightenment*, (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 357-70.

Plomer, Henry R. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*, London: Bibliographical Society, 1907.

Plomer, Henry and Arundell Esdaile eds. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725*, Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Bibliographical Society, 1922.

Pocock J. G. A., 'Robert Brady, 1627-1700. A Cambridge Historian of the Restoration,' *Cambridge Historical Review* 10 (1951), 186-204.

-----. 'Modes of political and historical time in early eighteenth-century England,' in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985: 91-102.

-----. 'Thomas May and the narrative of the civil war' in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier eds. *Writing and political engagement in seventeen-century England* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999: 112-44.

Pollock, Linda. 'Honor, Gender and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570-1700,' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 3-29.

Portelli, A. 'Oral History as Genre' in Mary Chamberlain and Paul Thompson eds. *Narrative and Genre*, London: Routledge, 1998: 23-40.

Porter, Roy. 'History of the Body Reconsidered,' in Peter Burke ed. *New Perspectives in Historical Writing*, Second edition Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001: 233-260.

Potter, Lois. 'The Royal Martyr in the Restoration: National Grief and National Sin,' in Thomas Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999: 240-262.

Purkiss, Diane. *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in early modern Britain* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Reed, John. 'History and Narrative Identity: Religious Dissent and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England,' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 46-63.

Richardson, Roger. *The Debate on the English Revolution*, Third Edition Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

-----. 'Re-fighting the English Revolution: John Nalson (1637-1686) and the Frustrations of Late Seventeenth-Century English Historiography,' *European Review of History* 14 (2007), 1-20

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative: Volume III*. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1984.

-----. 'Narrative Identity,' *Philosophy Today* 35 (1991): 73-81.

-----. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2004.

Rigney, James. '"To lye upon a Stationers stall, like a piece of coarse flesh in a Shambles": the sermon, print and the English Civil War,' in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough eds. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, literature and history, 1600-1750*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000: 188-207.

Roberts, S.R. 'Public or Private? Revenge and recovery at the restoration of Charles II,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986), 172-88.

Roper, Alan. 'Drawing Parallels and Making Applications in Restoration Literature: the Language of Political Conflict in Restoration Literature' in *Politics as Reflected in Literature*, Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989: 40-45.

Roper, Michael. 'Re-remembering the Soldier Hero: the Psychic and Social Construction of Memory in Personal Narratives of the Great War,' *History Workshop Journal* 50 (2000), 181-204.

-----. 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History,' *History Workshop Journal* 59 (2005), 57-72.

Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s, revolution, religion and war*, Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1999.

Rose, Jacqueline. 'Royal ecclesiastical supremacy and the Restoration church,' *Historical Research* 80 (2007), 324-45.

Ross, Richard J. 'The Memorial Culture of Early Modern English Lawyers: Memory as Keyword, Shelter, and Identity, 1560-1640' *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities* 10 (1998), 229-326.

Rudolph, Julia. *Revolution by degrees: James Tyrrell and Whig political thought in the late seventeenth century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Runia, Eelco. '"Forget About It": "Parallel Processing" in the Srebrenica Report,' *History and Theory* 43 (2004), 295-320.

-----. 'Presence,' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 1-29.

Rüsen, Jörn. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005.

Salmon, J. H. M. *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Sawday, Jonathan. 'Re-writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992): 171-199.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: the making and unmaking of the world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schneider, Gary. *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005.

Schwartz, Barry. 'The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory,' in *Social Forces* 61 (1982): 374-402.

Scott, David. *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004.

Scott, Jonathan. 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot,' in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie eds. *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990: 108-131.

-----. *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

-----. 'Restoration Process. Or, If This Isn't a Party, We're Not Having a Good Time,' *Albion* 25 (1993), 619-37.

-----. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English political instability in European context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000.

Seaward, Paul. *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989.

-----. *The Restoration, 1660-1688*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991.

-----. 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism,' in *Historical Journal* 40 (1997), 227-239.

-----. '"Chief Ways of God": Form and Meaning in the *Behemoth* of Thomas Hobbes'' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 169-188.

-----. 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the civil wars of Europe,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 289-303.

Serjeantson, R. W. 'Testimony and Proof in Early-Modern England,' *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 30 (1999), 195-236.

Shapin, Steven. *The Social History of Truth: civility and science in seventeenth-century England*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Shapiro, Barbara. A *Culture of the Fact: England. 1550-1720*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England: The culture of seventeen-century politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

-----.'Reading Revelations: prophecy, hermeneutics and politics in early modern Britain' in Kevin Sharpe and Stephen Zwicker eds. *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003: 122-63.

Shepherd, Alexandra. 'From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700,' *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005), 281-295.'

Sherlock, Peter. 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory,' *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 263-289.

Shuger, Debora. 'Life-writing in seventeenth-century England' in Patrick Coleman, Jayne Lewis, and Jill Kowalik eds. *Representations of the Self from the Renaissance to Romanticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000: 63-78.

Smith, Alan G. R. *The Government of Elizabethan England*, London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

Smith, Constance I. 'Review essay: *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History* by Julian H. Franklin,' *History and Theory* 4 (1964), 96-105.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685*, London: Macmillian, 1999.

Snyder, Henry Leonard. 'David Jones, Augustan historian and pioneer English annalist,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 44 (1980), 11-26.

Sommerville, Johann P. 'Hobbes, *Behemoth*, Church-State Relations and Political Obligation'' *Filozofski Vestnik* 24 (2003), 205-222.

Spaeth, Donald A. *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Spalding, Ruth. *The improbable puritan: a life of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675*, London: Faber and Faber, 1975,

Springborg, Patricia. *Mary Astell: theorist of freedom from domination*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, New Haven: Yale University, 1991.

-----. 'Religion in Restoration England,' in Lionel K. Glassey ed. *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII & II*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997; 90-124.

-----. *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age,'* Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

-----. '"A Special kindness for dead bishops": The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 313-335.

-----. *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*, Harlow: Longman, 2006.

Starkie, Andrew. 'Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 335-43.

Stoyle, Mark. *Loyalty and Locality: popular allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994.

-----. 'Memories of the Maimed: The Testimony of King Charles's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730,' *History* 88 (2003).

-----. 'Remembering the English Civil Wars' in Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (eds.) *The Memory of Catastrophe*, Manchester: Manchester University, 2004: 19-30.

Tatham, G. B. *Dr John Walker and* The Sufferings of the Clergy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

Tinkler, John F. 'The Rhetorical Method of Francis Bacon's *History of the Reign of King Henry VII' History and Theory* (1987), 32- 52.

Thomson, Alistair. *ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. *Narrating Our Pasts: The social construction of oral history*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992.

Vaughan, Megan. "Reported Speech and Other Kinds of Testimony" *Journal of Historical Sociology* 13 (2000): 237-63.

Walker, Garthine. '"Just Stories: Telling Tales of Infant Death in Early Modern England' in Margaret Mikesell and Adele Seeff eds. *Culture and Change: Attending to Early Modern Women*, London: Associated University Presses, 2003: 98-115.

Walsh, John, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor eds. 'Introduction' *The Church of England c. 1689 – c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 1-64.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Watkins, John. *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: literature, history, sovereignty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Watson, G. 'The Augustan Civil War,' *Review of English Studies* 36 (1985), 321-37.

Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1987.

Withers, C. 'Reporting, Mapping, Trusting: making geographical knowledge in the late seventeen-century,' *Isis* 90 (1999), 497-521.

Wood, Andy. *The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country, 1520-1770*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Woolf, D.R. *The idea of history in early Stuart England: erudition, ideology, and 'The light of truth' from the accession of James I to the Civil War*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990

-----. 'Conscience, Constancy, and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell,' in John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf eds. *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays presented to G.E. Aylmer*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1993: 243-278.

-----. 'A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800,' *American Historical Review* 102 (1997), 645-679.

-----. 'Narrative Historical Writing in Restoration England: A Preliminary Survey' in W. Gerald Marshall ed. *The Restoration Mind*, Newark, NJ: University of Delaware, 1997: 207-51.

-----. *Reading History in Early Modern England, 1475-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

-----. 'Speaking of History: Conversations about the past in Restoration England' in Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (eds.) *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1700*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

-----. *The Social Circulation of the Past: English historical culture, 1500-1730*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

-----. 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 33-70.

-----. 'Images of the Antiquary in Seventeen-century England,' in Susan Pierce ed. *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1707-2007* London: Society of Antiquaries, 2007: 11-36.

-----. 'Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past,' in Q. Edward Wang and Franz L. Fillafer eds. *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-cultural approaches to Historiography, Essays in Honor of Georg G. Iggers*, New York: Berghahn Books, 2007: 71-103.

-----, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Enlightenment,' in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume III: 1400-1800*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution: 1625-1660*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wootton, David. 'Thomas Hobbes's Machiavellian Moments' in Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks eds. *The Historical Imagination in early modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997: 210-42.

Worden, Blair. 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England,' *Past and Present* 109 (1985), 55-99.

-----. 'Review: The "Diary" of Bulstrode Whitelocke,' *English Historical Review* 108 (1993), 122-134.

-----. 'Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, and the Restoration' in Gerald Maclean (ed.), *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 111-156.

-----. 'The question of secularization,' in Alan Houston and Steven Pincus eds. *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 20-40.

-----. *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity*, London: Peguin, 2002.

-----. 'Historians and Poets,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 71-95.

Wykes, David L. '"To let the Memory of these Men Dye is Injurious to Posterity": Edmund Calamy's *Account* of the Ejected Ministers,' *Studies in Church History*, 33 (1997), 379-392.

-----. 'Dissenters and the Writing of History: Ralph Thoresby's "Lives and Characters,"' in Jason McElligott ed. *Fear, exclusion and revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006: 174-188.

Wysochogrod, E. *An Ethics of Remembering: History, Heterology and the nameless others*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Yates, Frances. *The Art of Memory*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

-----. *The Elephant in the Room: Silence and Denial in Everyday Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Zwicker, Steven N. 'Lines of authority: politics and literary culture in the Restoration' in Kevin M. Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker eds. *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987: 230-70.

II. Unpublished Theses

Hartman, Mark. 'Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution, 1640-1660,' Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 1978.

Hudson, Geoffrey. 'Ex-servicemen, war widows and the English county pension scheme, 1593-1679,' Oxford: Unpublished DPhil thesis, 1995.

Tapsell, Grant. 'Politics and Political Discourse in the British Monarchies, 1681-5,' Cambridge: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2003.

III. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* Entries

Burns, William E. 'Winstanley, William (*d.* 1698).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/29760, (accessed 15 Jan 2007).

Callow, John. 'Coke, Roger (c.1628-1704x7).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5829, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Chesshyre, Hubert. 'Walker, Sir Edward (1612-1677).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28475 (accessed 16 Jan 2008).

Coleby, Andrew M. 'Northleigh, John (1656/7–1705).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20331, (accessed 11 Mar 2008).

Davies, Michael. 'Pardoe, William (1630-31-1692).'In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/21260, (accessed 15 Jan 2007).

Du Toit, Alexander. 'Jones, David (fl. 1675-1720).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14988, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Firth, C. H. rev. Timothy Venning 'Phelps, John (b. 1618/19).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22091, (accessed 12 September 2007).

Fritze, Ronald H. 'Herbert, Sir Thomas, first baronet (1606-1682).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13049, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Furdell, Elizabeth Lane. 'Bate, George (1608-1668).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1661, (accessed 16 May 2007).

-----. 'Welwood, James (1652-1727).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29023, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Gilbert, C. D. 'Oasland, Henry (bap. 1625, d. 1703).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/20434, (accessed 15 Jan 2007).

Gordon, Alexander, rev. N. H. Keeble, 'Sylvester, Matthew (1636/37-1708).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26874, (accessed 6 Feb 2008).

Hayton, D. H. 'Berkeley, John, first Baron of Berkeley of Stratton (bap. 1607, d. 1678).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2217, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Keeble, N. H. 'Baxter, Richard (1615-1691).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/1734, (accessed 15 March 2007).

Kelsey, Sean. 'Ashburham, John (1602/3-1671).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/738, (accessed 31 Jan 2008).

Love, Harold. 'L'Estrange, Sir Roger (1616-1704).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16514, (accessed 17 May 2007).

Martin, G. H. 'Frankland, Thomas (1632-1690).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10086, (accessed 16 May 2007).

Milton, Anthony. 'Laud, William (1573-1645).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/16112, (accessed 29 Jan 2007)

Norbrook, David. 'Hutchinson [née Apsley], Lucy (1620-1681).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.ezproxy. library.ualberta.ca/view/ article/14285, (accessed 15 Jan 2007).

Raymond, Joad. 'Rushworth , John (c.1612-1690).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24288, (accessed 16 May 2007).

Richardson, R. C. 'Nalson, John (bap. 1637, d. 1686).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19734, (accessed 16 May 2007).

Seaward, Paul. 'Morice, Sir William (1602–1676).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19255, (accessed 6 Mar 2008).

Smith, David. 'Warwick, Sir Philip (1609-1683).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28800, (accessed 24 Jan 2008).

Spalding, Ruth. 'Whitelocke, Bulstrode, appointed Lord Whitelocke under the protectorate (1605-1675).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Oct 2005. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29297, (accessed 16 May 2007).

Speck, W. A. 'Hyde, Laurence, first earl of Rochester (*bap.* 1642, *d.* 1711).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison eds. Oxford:

Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed. edited by Lawrence Goldman, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14332, (accessed 26 Nov 2007).